DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 292 TM 027 834

AUTHOR	Selfa, Lance A.; Suter, Natalie; Myers, Sharon; Koch, Shaun; Johnson, Robert A.; Zahs, Daniel A.; Kuhr, Brian D.; Abraham, Sameer Y.; Zimbler, Linda J.
TITLE	1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93). Methodology Report.
INSTITUTION	National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, IL.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	NCES-97-467
PUB DATE	1997-10-00
NOTE	719p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF04/PC29 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Colleges; Data Analysis; Data Collection; *Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; National Surveys; Reliability; *Research Methodology; Sample Size; Sampling; *Teacher Characteristics; Validity
IDENTIFIERS	*National Study of Postsecondary Faculty

ABSTRACT

The 1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-88), later named the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, was the first comprehensive study of higher education instructional faculty conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics since 1963. This report provides a description of the 1993 NSOPF and the data generated by its methodology. The report is organized into 11 chapters and begins by introducing NSOPF-93 in the context of the earlier study in 1988. Chapter 2 details the data collection instruments, while chapter 3 discusses the NSOPF-93 sample design and implementation. Chapter 4 reviews institutional recruitment procedures and their results. Data collection procedures are discussed in chapter 5, and chapter 6 discusses data processing and control. Chapters 7 and 8 deal with institution and faculty response and nonresponse and questionnaire item response. Chapter 9 examines data quality in terms of validity and reliability. Chapter 10 examines faculty counts and summarizes the procedures used to reconcile discrepancies and to calculate best estimates for the NSOPF-93 faculty dataset. Recommendations for future NSOPF studies are found in chapter 11. The full-scale NSOPF-93 included an institution-level survey of 817 colleges and universities in the United States and a survey completed by 25,780 faculty members. Eighteen appendixes contain survey instruments, cover letters, and additional details about the research methodology. (Contains 61 exhibits.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM
In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. HE

ED 412 292

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Methodology Report October 1997

1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

Methodology Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TM027834

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement NCES 97-467

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM
In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view HE

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Methodology Report **October 1997**

1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

Methodology Report

Lance A. Selfa
Natalie Suter
Sharon Myers
Shaun Koch
Robert A. Johnson
Daniel A. Zahs
Brian D. Kuhr
Sameer Y. Abraham
National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago

Linda J. Zimbler, Project Officer
National Center for Education Statistics

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement **NCES 97-467**

U.S. Department of Education
Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Ricky T. Takai
Acting Assistant Secretary

National Center for Education Statistics
Pascal D. Forgione, Jr.
Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to:

National Center for Education Statistics
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208–5574

October 1997

The NCES World Wide Web Home Page address is
http://www.ed.gov/NCES/

Suggested Citation
U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. *[1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)] Methodology Report*, NCES 97-467, by Lance A. Selfa, Natalie Suter, Sharon Myers, Shaun Koch, Robert A. Johnson, Daniel A. Zahs, Brian D. Kuhr, and Sameer Y. Abraham. Project Officer: Linda J. Zimbler. Washington, DC: 1997.

Contact:
Linda J. Zimbler
(202) 219–1834

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the many individuals who contributed to the success of the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93).

The NSOPF-93 National Technical Review Panel (NTRP) played an important role in advising the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and its contractor for NSOPF-93—the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago—on questionnaire development and related design issues. A list of individual NTRP members can be found in Appendix Q.

Additional support for NSOPF-93 was provided by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Both agencies are co-sponsors of the study, and both have supported the field test and the full-scale study. Our special thanks are extended to NSF's **Larry Suter**, **Jim Dietz**, **Mary Golladay**, **Joan Burrelli** and **Roger Baldwin** (the latter currently at the College of William and Mary), and to NEH's **Jeff Thomas** for their unstinting efforts on behalf of NSOPF-93.

The study was overseen by NCES staff. **Paul D. Planchon** is the Associate Commissioner, Surveys and Cooperative Systems Group. **Roslyn Korb** and **Daniel Kasprzyk** provided additional oversight. **Linda Zimbler** is the NCES Project Officer responsible for NSOPF-93. Other NCES staff who assisted in various aspects of the study include **Sue Ahmed**, **Sam Barbette**, **Robert Burton**, **Michael Cohen**, **Steve Kaufman**, **Edith McArthur**, **Marilyn McMillen**, **Sam Peng**, **Mary Rollefson**, **Dennis Carroll**, and **Larry Bobbitt**.

Sameer Abraham was the Project Director for NSOPF-93 until April, 1996. **Natalie Suter**, the current Project Director, served as Associate Project Director, Task Leader for Questionnaire Development, and Coordinator of Data Collection and Data File Preparation. Other principal members of the NSOPF-93 team include the following NORC staff: **Bruce Spencer**, Task Leader for Sampling; **Tracy Berckmans**, Task Leader for Faculty Data Collection; **Brian Kuhr**, Task Leader for Institution Data Collection; **Sharon Myers**, Coordinator of List Processing; **Robert Bailey**, Task Leader for Data Preparation; **Karen Grigorian** and **Belinda Willis**, Data Preparation Supervisors; **Suzanne Turner**, **David Kusinitz**, and **Marek Pietrzyk**, Data Processing Managers; **Shaun Koch**, Task Leader for Data Delivery; **Lance Selfa**, Task Leader for Survey Documentation; **Kirk M. Wolter**, Senior Vice President, Statistics and Methodology; **Robert Johnson**, Senior Survey Methodologist; **Daniel Zahs** and **Hee Choon Shin**, Survey Methodologists; **Jiahe Qian**, Statistician; **Terry Callier**, Programmer; **Hiroaki Minato**, **Kelly Daley**, **Patrick Smillie** and **Kristen Petzinger**, Research Assistants; **Jamie Friedman**, Telephone Center Supervisor; and **Daniel Sichelski**, **Meredith Roat**, and **Robert Dustin**, Budget Monitors. **Sally Murphy** and **Ezella Pickett** coordinated refusal conversion and locating efforts during data collection. **Jim Wolf** served as a consultant in the preparation of the institution data file. **Suzanne Erfurth** and **Karen Rosenthal** provided editorial assistance. Additional assistance and support was generously provided by: **Norman Bradburn**, **Patricia Green**, **Bernard Dugoni**, **Gloria Evenson**, **Marilyn Ford**, **Jay Goddard**, **Steven Ingels**, **Donald Kotecki**, **Richard Kulka**, **Kenneth Rasinski**, **Karen Sutherlin**, and **Lisa Thalji**.

Under a subcontract from the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), **Rita Kirshstein** of Pelavin Research Institute assisted in development of the questionnaires, designed and conducted most of the data analysis, and assisted in related project tasks. **Valerie Martin Conley** of Synectics, Inc., provided technical guidance on various aspects of the study. **Steve Wenck** of Synectics, Inc., provided technical support. Additional support was provided by project consultants: **James Fairweather** of Pennsylvania State University, **Robert Blackburn** and **Janet Lawrence** of the University of Michigan, and **Kathryn Moore** of Michigan State University.

The authors wish to express their gratitude to NCES reviewers and other reviewers of this document. The following individuals served as the principal reviewers, and provided valuable feedback and helpful suggestions: **Daniel Kasprzyk**, **Roslyn Korb**, **Linda Zimbler**, **Robert Burton**, **Michael Cohen**, **Steve Kaufman**, and **Marilyn McMillen**, NCES; **Valerie Conley**, Synectics, Inc.; **Jeff Thomas**, NEH, and **Jay Chronister**, University of Virginia.

Finally, the authors would like to express their gratitude to the thousands of Institutional Coordinators, institution respondents, Chief Administrative Officers and individual faculty members who participated in the study. Without their cooperation, NSOPF-93 could never have been completed.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 1
    1.1 Organization of the Methodology Report 1
    1.2 Background: NSOPF-88 1
    1.3 Background: NSOPF-93 2
    1.4 NSOPF-93 Field Test 3
    1.5 NSOPF-93 Full-Scale Study 3
    1.6 Restricted-use Data File and Documentation 4
    1.7 Public-use Data Files and Documentation 4
    1.8 Derived Variables 4
    1.9 Electronic Codebooks on CD-ROM and Documentation 5
    1.10 Data Analysis System on CD-ROM and Documentation 5
    1.11 How to Obtain NSOPF-93 Products 6

2. Data Collection Instruments 9
    2.1 Overview 9
    2.2 Development of Questionnaire Items 9
    2.3 Faculty Questionnaire 10
    2.4 Institution Questionnaire 11

3. Sample Design and Implementation 25
    3.1 NSOPF-93 Sample Design 25
    3.2 Institution Universe 25
    3.3 Faculty Universe 26
    3.4 Sampling Frame 26
    3.5 First Stage Sampling: Institution-Level 30
    3.6 Institution Nonresponse 31
    3.7 Institution Replacements 32
    3.8 Second Stage Sampling: Faculty-Level 32
    3.9 Subsampling of Faculty 34
    3.10 Calculation of Weights 34
    3.11 First-Stage Institution Weights 35
    3.12 Calculation of Faculty Weights 37
    3.13 Calculation of Weights for Institution Questionnaires 40
    3.14 Design Effects and Approximate Standard Errors 41
    3.15 Calculating Estimates for Institutions Selected with Certainty 51
    3.16 Using Replicate Weights with the NSOPF-93 Datasets 51
        3.16.1 Faculty File Replicate Weights 52
        3.16.2 Institution File Replicate Weights 52

4. Institutional Recruitment: Procedures and Results 55
    4.1 OMB Clearance and Mail Procedures 56
        4.1.1 Initial Mailout and Remailings 57
        4.1.2 Mail Follow-up Procedures 58
        4.1.3 Mailouts to Supplemental Sample 58
    4.2 Telephone Follow-up Procedures 58
        4.2.1 Selection and Training of Prompters 58
        4.2.2 Initial Telephone Contact and Follow-up 59

Table of Contents (cont.)

4.2.3 Additional Telephone Follow-up for Nonresponse ... 59
4.2.4 Refusals and Problem Cases ... 60
4.2.5 Telephone Follow-up of List Discrepancies/Retrieval ... 60
4.3 Revised Data Collection Plan ... 60
4.4 Results of Institution Recruitment ... 62

5. Data Collection Procedures and Implementation ... 65
5.1 Overview ... 65
5.2 Faculty Survey ... 66
5.2.1 Faculty Mail and Telephone Follow-up ... 66
5.2.2 Faculty Locating and Eligibility Screening Procedures ... 68
5.2.3 Faculty Refusal Conversion ... 69
5.2.4 Follow-up with Specific Subgroups of Faculty ... 69
5.2.5 Faculty Follow-up by Institutional Coordinators ... 70
5.2.6 Faculty Telephone Interviews ... 70
5.2.7 Field Interviewing and Locating ... 70
5.2.8 Faculty Data Retrieval ... 71
5.3 Data Collection Results: Faculty Questionnaire ... 71
5.4 Institution Survey ... 75
5.4.1 Initial Mailing to Institution Respondent ... 75
5.4.2 Postcard Prompts to Institutions ... 75
5.4.3 Second Questionnaire Mailing to Institutions ... 76
5.4.4 Telephone Prompting and Follow-up of Institutions ... 76
5.4.5 Third Questionnaire Mailing to Institutions ... 76
5.4.6 Interviewer-Assisted Data Collection at Institutions ... 77
5.4.7 Data Abstraction at Institutions ... 77
5.4.8 Institution Data Retrieval ... 78
5.5 Data Collection Results: Institution Questionnaire ... 78

6. Data Control and Data Processing ... 81
6.1 Overview ... 81
6.2 Faculty List Processing and Preparation for Sampling ... 81
6.3 Receipt Control and Monitoring of Institution and Faculty Questionnaires ... 82
6.4 Data Entry and Coding ... 83
6.4.1 Data Entry ... 83
6.4.2 Faculty Questionnaire Coding ... 83
6.4.3 Faculty Questionnaire Eligibility Review ... 87
6.4.4 Institution Questionnaire Coding ... 87
6.5 Scan Editing, Machine Editing, and Imputation ... 90
6.5.1 Faculty Questionnaire Editing and Imputation ... 90
6.5.2 Institution Questionnaire Editing and Imputation ... 92
6.6 Retrieval of Missing Data ... 93
6.7 Storage and Protection of Completed Instruments ... 94

7. Institution and Faculty Unit Response and Nonresponse ... 95
7.1 Institution Response Rates and Participation Rates ... 95
7.2 Characteristics of Institution Questionnaire Response and Nonresponse ... 95

Table of Contents (cont.)

7.3 Faculty Questionnaire Response Rates 97
7.4 Faculty Eligibility 98
7.5 Summary: An Assessment of NSOPF-93 Faculty Response Rates 99

8. Questionnaire Item Nonresponse 103
  8.1 Item Nonresponse: Definition and Considerations 103
  8.2 Faculty Questionnaire Item Nonresponse 104
    8.2.1 Nonresponse by Item Placement, Item Topic, and Administration Mode 104
    8.2.2 Items with High Item Nonresponse 108
  8.3 Institution Questionnaire Item Nonresponse 108
    8.3.1 Item Nonresponse by Questionnaire Position and Topic 109
    8.3.2 Items with High Item Nonresponse 110

9. Faculty Questionnaire Data Quality 113
  9.1 Validity and Reliability in the NSOPF-93 Field Test 113
  9.2 Changes to the 1993 Full Scale Study 114
  9.3 Validity in the 1993 Full Scale Study 115
  9.4 An Assessment of Validity for the 1993 Full Scale Study 120
  9.5 Data Quality and Faculty Population Estimates 121

10. Institution Recontact, Best Estimates, and Post-Stratification 123
  10.1 Accuracy of National Population Estimates 123
  10.2 Discrepancies in Faculty Counts 125
  10.3 Obtaining Verification from Institutions 131
  10.4 Deriving Unweighted "Best Estimates" of NSOPF-93 Faculty 134
  10.5 The Impact of the "Best Estimates" 136
  10.6 Poststratification to Best Estimates 138
  10.7 Comparability Issues Regarding NSOPF-93 Faculty Questionnaire Data 140
    10.7.1 Definition of Instructional Faculty 140
    10.7.2 Comparison of NSOPF-93 with Other Survey Data 141
    10.7.3 A Special Note about Estimates of Health Sciences Faculty 143

11. Recommendations 145
  11.1 Changing Data Collection Time Frames and Commencing List Collection Later 145
  11.2 Increasing the Use of Telephone Interviews 146
  11.3 Providing Institutions with an Information Sheet at the Time of List Collection 146
  11.4 Coordinating Institution Questionnaire Mailing and List Collection 147
  11.5 Routing Institutional Coordinator Packet to Institutional Research Director 148
  11.6 Changing Institution Questionnaire Instructions and Questions 148
  11.7 Eliminating Option of Sending Computer Tapes 149
  11.8 Providing Diskette or List Layout Example 149
  11.9 Scanning Hardcopy Faculty Lists 150
  11.10 Using the Internet 150
  11.11 Maximizing Early Awareness of the Study 150
  11.12 Requesting Address Updates from Institutional Coordinator 151
  11.13 Requesting System-wide Data 151
  11.14 Cognitive Research to Aid Institution Data Collection 151

Table of Contents (cont.)

11.15 Changes to Faculty Questionnaire 151
11.16 Nonresponse Adjustment by Faculty Discipline 152
11.17 Number of Replicate Weights 152
11.18 Poststratification to Institution Questionnaire Counts 152
11.19 Overlap Sample Design for Future NSOPF Cycles 153

Exhibits

Exhibit 2-1: NSOPF faculty questionnaire: content and linkage of items between 1988 and 1993 NSOPF cycles . . . 12
Exhibit 2-2: NSOPF institution questionnaire: content and linkage of items between 1988 and 1993 NSOPF cycles . . . 20
Exhibit 3-1: Institutional sample 1988 design, 1993 design, and NSOPF-93 frame . . . 29
Exhibit 3-2: Classification of institutions by eligibility and cooperation . . . 37
Exhibit 3-3: Profile of faculty sampling lists . . . 39
Exhibit 3-4: Summary statistics for NSOPF-93 faculty and institution weights . . . 41
Exhibit 3-5: NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire: standard errors and design effects . . . 45
Exhibit 3-6: NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire standard errors and design effects . . . 47
Exhibit 3-7: Mean design effects (DEFF) and root design effects (DEFT) for NSOPF-93 faculty subgroups . . . 50
Exhibit 3-8: Finite population correction factors (fpc) for each institution stratum . . . 54
Exhibit 4-1: Institutional participation rates for NSOPF cycles . . . 62
Exhibit 4-2: NSOPF-93 institution participation rates by type of institution . . . 63
Exhibit 4-3: Items provided by participating institutions . . . 63
Exhibit 4-4: NSOPF-93 faculty list content . . . 64
Exhibit 5-1: Chronology of NSOPF-93 data collection . . . 66
Exhibit 5-2: NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire mail and telephone schedule (dates mailed and percent of original sample targeted) . . . 67
Exhibit 5-3: Faculty response rates by initial mailing date . . . 72
Exhibit 5-4: Faculty response rates by level and control of institution . . . 72
Exhibit 5-5: Faculty response rates by institution sampling stratum . . . 73
Exhibit 5-6: Faculty response rates by faculty sampling characteristics . . . 74
Exhibit 5-7: Response rates for faculty members whose institutions supplied their home address, by employment status . . . 75
Exhibit 5-8: Institution questionnaire response rates by institution sampling stratum . . . 79
Exhibit 5-9: Institution questionnaire response rates by mode of administration . . . 80
Exhibit 5-10: Institution response rates by cycle . . . 80
Exhibit 7-1: Institution questionnaire and faculty list response rates (unweighted) by sample component . . . 95
Exhibit 7-2: Institution questionnaire response rate and faculty list participation rate (weighted) by institution type and control . . . 96
Exhibit 7-3: Institution questionnaire response rate and faculty list participation rate (weighted) by institution sampling stratum . . . 97
Exhibit 7-4: Faculty response rates (unweighted) by NSOPF cycle . . . 98
Exhibit 7-5: Faculty response and nonresponse status . . . 99
Exhibit 7-6: Faculty questionnaire and overall response rates by institutional characteristics . . . 101
Exhibit 7-7: Faculty response rates by individual characteristics . . . 102
Exhibit 8-1: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire by thirds (unweighted data) . . . 105
Exhibit 8-2: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire by topic (unweighted data) . . . 106
Exhibit 8-3: Mean item nonresponse rates for critical items on the faculty questionnaire (unweighted data) . . . 106
Exhibit 8-4: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire, by questionnaire third and mode (unweighted data) . . . 107
Exhibit 8-5: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire by section and mode (unweighted data) . . . 108

Exhibits (cont.)

Exhibit 8-6: Mean item nonresponse rates for institution questionnaire by content area (unweighted data) 109
Exhibit 8-7: Mean item nonresponse rates for institution questionnaire by questionnaire third (unweighted data) 109
Exhibit 8-8: Mean item nonresponse rates for critical items on the institution questionnaire (unweighted data) 110
Exhibit 9-1: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by gender 116
Exhibit 9-2: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by full-time/part-time status 117
Exhibit 9-3: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by faculty discipline 118
Exhibit 9-4: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by race/ethnicity 119
Exhibit 9-5: Comparison of faculty and institution data, NSOPF-93: various measures 120
Exhibit 9-6: Measures of reliability and validity (unweighted data) 121
Exhibit 10-1: Estimates of total, full-time and part-time faculty teaching for-credit courses from four NSOPF sources (weighted) 123
Exhibit 10-2: Changes in health sciences faculty between NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93 (weighted) 124
Exhibit 10-3: NSOPF counts of total faculty (unweighted) by source and year 126
Exhibit 10-4: Discrepancies by institution characteristics: size, type and control mean differences (matched pairs t-tests), fall 1992 128
Exhibit 10-5: Discrepancies by sampling stratum mean differences (matched pairs t-tests), fall 1992 129
Exhibit 10-6: A comparison of matched institutions and the 100 institutions with the largest discrepancies (unweighted frequencies) 130
Exhibit 10-7: Sources for verified estimates from reconciliation effort, fall 1992 (*n*=492) 132
Exhibit 10-8: Explanations institutions gave for discrepancies between LIST and QUEX, fall 1992 (*n*=492) (unweighted frequencies) 133
Exhibit 10-9: Difference between verified data and original faculty list by first reason for discrepancy, fall 1992 (weighted data) 138
Exhibit 10-10: NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire best estimates 139
Exhibit 10-11: Estimates of total, full-time and part-time faculty teaching for-credit courses from four NSOPF sources 140
Exhibit 10-12: Number of instructional faculty (X01_1=1), by modified NSOPF-88 stratum 141
Exhibit 10-13: Percent of instructional faculty by institution type (X01_1=1), by modified NSOPF-88 stratum 141
Exhibit 10-14: Comparison of 1992-93 salaries between NSOPF and AAUP surveys 142
Exhibit 10-15: Comparison of 1992-93 salaries among AAUP, NSOPF-93 and IPEDS surveys 143
Exhibit 11-1: Sample data collection schedule 146

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendices

Appendix A: 1988 NSOPF Questionnaire for Departments
Appendix B: 1988 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire
Appendix C: 1988 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire
Appendix D: 1993 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire and Reinterview Questionnaire—Pilot Test
Appendix E: 1993 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire—Pilot Test
Appendix F: 1993 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire
Appendix G: 1993 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire
Appendix H: 1993 NSOPF Abbreviated Faculty Questionnaire
Appendix I: Critical Items and Nonresponse: 1993 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire
Appendix J: Critical Items and Nonresponse: 1993 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire
Appendix K: Letters and Forms for Institution Recruitment:
    Letter to Chief Administrative Officer
    Letter to Institutional Official
    Confirmation Form
    Faculty List Documentation Form
    Checklist (reverse side of Faculty List Documentation Form)
    Instructions for Preparing Lists of Faculty
    Instructions for Preparing Machine-Readable Lists of Faculty
    Affidavit of Nondisclosure
    1993 NSOPF Brochure
Appendix L: Letters to Faculty Questionnaire Respondents
    Initial Cover Letter to Faculty
    Second Faculty Questionnaire Mailing
    Third Faculty Questionnaire Mailing
Appendix M: Letters to Institution Questionnaire Respondents
    Initial Cover Letter to Institutions that Provided Faculty Lists
    Initial Cover Letter to Institutions that Did Not Provide Faculty Lists
    Follow-up Postcard
Appendix N: Letter to Institution Coordinator for Faculty Follow-up
Appendix O: Derived Variables
    Exhibit O-1: Discipline Crosswalk, NSOPF 1988-1993
    Exhibit O-2: Derived Variable Crosswalk to NSOPF-88
Appendix P: Imputation Flags for the Institution Data File (Public-use)
    Imputation Flags for the Faculty Data File (Restricted-use)
Appendix Q: NSOPF-1993 National Technical Review Panel (NTRP) Members
Appendix R: Technical Report: Discrepancies in Faculty Estimates in the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty

1. Introduction

1.1 Organization of the Methodology Report

The *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report* is designed to give readers an accurate picture of this important study and the data generated by its methodology. The report is organized into 11 chapters, and begins by introducing NSOPF-93 in the context of the earlier NSOPF-88 study. Chapter 2 details the data collection instruments, while Chapter 3 discusses the NSOPF-93 sample design and implementation. Next, the Methodology Report moves on to review institutional recruitment procedures and their results in Chapter 4. The report then examines the data collection procedures (Chapter 5) and data control and processing (Chapter 6). Chapters 7 and 8 deal with institution and faculty unit response and nonresponse, and questionnaire item nonresponse. Chapter 9 examines data quality in terms of validity and reliability. Chapter 10 examines faculty counts and summarizes the procedures used to reconcile discrepancies and to calculate "best estimates" for the NSOPF-93 faculty dataset. Finally, Chapter 11 offers recommendations for future NSOPF studies.

1.2 Background: NSOPF-88

The 1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-88)—whose successor study was renamed the National *Study* of Postsecondary Faculty—was the first comprehensive study of higher education instructional faculty conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) since 1963. The National Endowment for the Humanities provided additional support. NSOPF-88 generated immediate interest in the higher education community because prior to the release of these data there had been very little comprehensive information available on this topic. The survey provided a national profile of faculty in two-year, four-year, doctoral-granting, and other public and private non-proprietary institutions. Information was gathered on the professional backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes of both full- and part-time instructional faculty. In addition, data were collected from institutional representatives and department-level respondents on such issues as faculty composition, new hires, departures and recruitment, retention, and tenure policies.

The 1988 study, conducted by SRI International, involved both field test and full-scale survey components. The field test targeted a sample of 105 non-proprietary two-year and four-year institutions, 235 faculty, and 91 department chairpersons (from 51 four-year institutions and a supplement of 40 two-year and four-year institutions). Ninety-one percent of the institutions participated in the field test by returning their faculty lists. Questionnaire responses were obtained from 80 percent of institutional representatives (two and four-year institutions, excluding specialized institutions), 86 percent of the department chairpersons (four-year institutions only), and 68 percent of the faculty (two-year and four-year institutions).

The NSOPF-88 field test was conducted from July through October of 1987. It was designed primarily to test the relative effectiveness of two alternative data collection strategies, to determine the most effective procedures for obtaining lists of faculty, and to examine the adequacy of the questionnaires. The results of the field test informed the design of the full-scale NSOPF-88 study. A brief synopsis of the field test procedures and results can be found in the *National Survey of Instructional Staff: Field Test Methodology Report* (U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics: Washington, D.C., March 8, 1988).

The NSOPF-88 full-scale study had three components: an institution-level survey of 480 colleges and universities in the United States; a survey of 3,029 eligible department chairpersons (or their equivalents) within the participating institutions; and a survey of 11,013 eligible faculty members within the same participating institutions. Data were collected for these three surveys between December 1987 and October 1988. Non-proprietary higher education institutions (two-year, four-year, or advanced degree) were stratified by size and assigned to strata adapted from the higher education institution classification system developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.[1] Within each stratum, institutions were randomly selected. Lists of faculty employed as of October 15, 1987 were requested from participating institutions, and of the 480 institutions selected, 449 (94 percent) agreed to participate and provided lists of their fall 1987 instructional faculty and department chairpersons. Within four-year institutions, faculty and department chairpersons were stratified by program area and selected; within two-year institutions, simple random samples of faculty and department chairpersons were selected; and within specialized institutions (religious, medical, etc.), only faculty were sampled. At all institutions, instructional faculty were stratified on the basis of employment status—full-time and part-time. Questionnaires that asked about activities during the 1987 fall term were mailed in 1988. Questionnaire responses were obtained from 424 institutions (88 percent), 2,427 department chairpersons (80 percent), and 8,383 instructional faculty (76 percent).

A discussion of the procedures and results of the 1988 full-scale study appears in *1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report* (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics: Washington, D.C., May 18, 1990). Four analytical reports were also prepared using NSOPF-88 data: *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988* [NCES 90-365]; *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education* [NCES 90-333]; *A Descriptive Report of Academic Departments in Higher Education Institutions* [NCES 90-339]; and *Profiles of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988* [NCES 91-389].

1.3 Background: NSOPF-93

Like its predecessor, NSOPF-93 was designed to provide a national profile of faculty in two-year, four-year (and above), doctoral-granting, public and private non-proprietary institutions, and to gather information on the backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes of both full- and part-time faculty. NSOPF-93 was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), a social science research center at the University of Chicago. NSOPF-93 was sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), with additional support from two co-sponsoring agencies, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). NEH and NSF sponsored sample augmentations for both the field test and full-scale study, and provided support for the study in its entirety. The sample augmentations were designed to provide higher levels of precision for faculty overall and to provide oversamples of specific subgroups of faculty, particularly full-time females; black, non-Hispanics; Asian/Pacific Islanders; Hispanics; and faculty in the humanities.

The second cycle of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) was conducted in response to a continuing need for data on faculty and other instructional personnel, all of whom directly affect the quality of education in postsecondary institutions. Faculties determine curriculum content, performance standards for students, and the quality of students' preparation for careers. In addition, faculty members perform research and development work upon which the nation's technological and economic advancement depend. For these reasons, it is essential to understand who they are; what they do; and whether, how, and why the nation's faculty are changing.

Data collected for the second cycle of NSOPF expand the current information base about faculty in several important ways. First, the data allow for comparisons to be made over time. Second, more detailed

---

[1] See *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Princeton, N.J., 1987).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

comparisons can be made because of the increase in both the institutional and faculty sample sizes. Third, these data examine critical issues surrounding faculty that have developed since the 1988 study. Fourth, to get a clearer and more accurate picture of faculty and instruction, NSOPF-93 expanded the definition of faculty to include both non-instructional faculty and non-faculty instructional personnel in higher education institutions. Henceforth, the term "faculty" will be used in its broadest sense to designate both non-instructional and instructional faculty and other instructional staff. Chapter 3 discusses the definitions of eligible faculty in greater detail.

1.4 NSOPF-93 Field Test

A field test of NSOPF-93 data collection instruments and survey procedures with a national probability sample of 136 institutions (54 core institutions, and 82 institutions selected to augment the core sample, funded by NSF) and 636 faculty was conducted between February and September 1992. The general purposes of the field test were to evaluate the adequacy of the faculty and institution questionnaires and to test key procedures to be used in the full-scale study.

Institutional cooperation was sought from all 136 institutions and a faculty list was solicited from each institution. The overall participation rate for faculty list collection was 89 percent (93 percent for the core sample and 87 percent for the augmented sample). The field test faculty sample consisted of 636 faculty selected from 53 participating core institutions. A total of 495 faculty participated, for a response rate of 82 percent. The institution survey was limited to the 120 participating institutions that had provided lists of faculty and/or confirmed their participation prior to September 1, 1992. Ninety four of these institutions responded to the institution questionnaire for a response rate of 78 percent (82 percent for the core institutions and 78 percent for the augmented sample).

The results of the field test informed the design of the full-scale study. A detailed discussion of the procedures and results of the 1992 field test appears in the *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Field Test Report* (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C., February 1994 [NCES 93-390]).

1.5 NSOPF-93 Full-Scale Study

For the NSOPF-93 full-scale study, the sample sizes were increased from 480 institutions and 11,013 faculty (in 1988), to 974 institutions and 31,354 faculty. The larger sample sizes allowed for more detailed comparisons and higher levels of precision at both the institution and faculty levels. The sample was also augmented to provide data about faculty in the humanities; faculty in these disciplines were oversampled, as were black, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; Asian/Pacific Islander; and full-time female faculty. As in the 1988 study, the sample consisted of non-proprietary two- and four-year (and above) higher education institutions stratified by a modified Carnegie classification and by faculty size. Institutional recruitment for the full-scale study began in October, 1992, when recruitment packets were mailed to the Chief Administrative Officers of 789 institutions. A supplemental sample of 185 institutions was added to ensure adequate representation across all strata. Of the 974 institutions in the total sample, 12 were found to be ineligible. Of the 962 eligible institutions, 817 institutions (85 percent) agreed to participate in the study (i.e., to provide lists of faculty employed during the 1992 Fall Term, that is, the term in progress on October 15, 1992). The faculty sample was selected from these 817 institutions. In 1993, questionnaires that asked primarily about the 1992 Fall term were mailed to institutions and faculty. (Specific questionnaire items are discussed in Chapter 2.)

The target sample for the faculty survey consisted of 31,354 faculty selected from 817 participating institutions. Of these, 1,590 were found to be ineligible. Of the 29,764 eligible faculty, 25,780 (87 percent) completed questionnaires either by self-administration or by a computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI).

Institution questionnaires were mailed to institution representatives at all 962 eligible institutions, including those that did not supply a list of faculty. Of the eligible institutions, 872 (91 percent) completed an institution questionnaire.

A survey report summarizing key results from the faculty survey is available: *Faculty and Instructional Staff: Who Are They and What Do They Do?* [NCES 94-346]. Other reports based on data from the NSOPF-93 faculty survey include: *Instructional Faculty and Staff in Higher Education Institutions: Fall 1987 and Fall 1992* [NCES 97-470] and *Characteristics and Attitudes of Instructional Faculty and Staff in the Humanities* [NCES 97-973]. Another report, *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education* [NCES 97-080] is based on the NSOPF-93 institution survey. These and future publications will also be available on the Internet on NCES's World Wide Web site at: http://www.ed.gov/NCES.

1.6 Restricted-use Data File and Documentation

A restricted-use data file has been produced for the NSOPF-93 faculty component on magnetic tape and on CD-ROM. The *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Data File User's Manual* [NCES 97-466] accompanies the NSOPF-93 data files appearing on magnetic tape and on CD-ROM.

The restricted-use data file has been released through individual licensing agreements to analysts who require access to the complete NCES data files for their research. Users agree, under penalty of law, that they shall not release any information that may lead to disclosure of a respondent's identity. The restricted-use data file contains data for 25,780 respondents from 817 participating institutions.

1.7 Public-use Data Files and Documentation

Public-use institution and faculty data files are also available on diskette or CD-ROM. The institution file contains data from the 872 postsecondary institutions that completed an institution questionnaire.

The public-use faculty data file contains data for 25,780 respondents from 817 participating institutions. Because multi-level micro data carry some risk of statistical disclosure of institutional or individual identities, the faculty data were subjected to an extensive deductive disclosure analysis to determine which items, used alone, in conjunction with other key variables, or in conjunction with public external sources such as NCES's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) files, have significant disclosure potential. To minimize the possible risk of disclosure of individual respondents, in compliance with the National Education Statistics Act, Public Law 103-382 [20 USC 9001 *et seq.*], the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, and the Privacy Act of 1974 [5 U.S.C. 552a], variables found to pose significant disclosure risks were modified or suppressed to remove or to substantially reduce such risks.

1.8 Derived Variables

For NSOPF-93, a total of 36 institution-level and 107 faculty-level derived variables were created in order to simplify access to standard queries useful to analysts as well as to enhance substantive analysis. Since research questions frequently require independent or control variables, this set of derived variables has been carefully constructed and added to the faculty and institution data files. The faculty restricted-use file includes all 143 derived variables. The institution file contains only the 36 institution-level derived variables. The public-use faculty file contains selected derived variables that were found not to pose significant disclosure risks.

Multiple sources of data were used to create institution-level derived variables including: the 1991-92 IPEDS, the "Carnegie classification" system, and NSOPF-93 sampling information. Documentation for all derived variables appears in Appendix O.

1.9 Electronic Codebooks on CD-ROM and Documentation

In addition to hardcopy codebooks that accompany the various releases of NSOPF-93 data, three NSOPF-93 electronic codebooks (ECBs) are also available to users. One ECB consists of the public-use institution file, another consists of the restricted-use faculty data file, and the other consists of the faculty restricted-use file merged with the public-use institution file. The ECBs feature windows with unweighted frequencies and percentages. A README.TXT file on the CD-ROM describes how to install the ECBs. Extensive "help" files and menus explain ECB features.

The ECB combines the convenience, simplicity, and cost efficiencies of personal computers (PCs) with CD-ROM technology. ECBs permit users to search for variables based on key words and names. The ECB displays full question text and unweighted frequencies for each variable in order to assist users in deciding which data elements may be useful for their analyses. The ECB can also be used as a tool for selecting variables for subsequent analysis, writing SAS or SPSS-PC code for file construction of the designated variables, and for generating a codebook of the chosen set of variables. More detailed information on the features of the NSOPF-93 ECBs appears in the *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Data File User's Manual* [NCES 97-466] and in the ECB "help" files and menus on the CD-ROM.

1.10 Data Analysis System on CD-ROM and Documentation

A NSOPF-93 faculty Data Analysis System (DAS) is also available. The DAS provides a convenient, menu-driven system allowing researchers to produce tables of frequencies and cross tabulations and correlation matrices. The NSOPF-93 sample is not a simple random sample. Therefore, simple random sample techniques for estimating sampling error cannot be applied to these data. The DAS takes into account the complexity of the sampling procedures and calculates standard errors appropriate for such samples. DAS software provides all information necessary for a user to set up and run a variety of analyses. Each DAS is self-documenting, with weighted data distributions and full descriptions for each variable. The DAS allows users to select variables for rows, columns, and subgroups for tables from the list of available variables, many of which have been computed to simplify analysis. Continuous variables, such as income, can be recoded into categories for rows, column percentages, or subgroup definitions. Categorical variables, such as race, can be grouped or "lumped" in various ways for analysis. Table titles as well as variable labels can be edited by the user, and DAS output is compatible with most spreadsheet software. In addition to the table estimates, the DAS calculates proper standard errors and weighted sample sizes for these estimates. If the number of valid cases does not meet the minimum requirement based on NCES statistical standards, the DAS prints the message "low-N." Users can also define variables for use in a correlation matrix, which can be imported into standard statistical packages for more complex analysis. More detailed information on the features of the NSOPF-93 DAS appears in the "help" files and menus on the DAS/CD-ROM.

1.11 How to Obtain NSOPF-93 Products

Restricted-use faculty data are available at no charge on a restricted loan basis to organizations that obtain an approved licensing agreement from NCES. To request a licensing agreement, the individual and/or institution must provide the following information:

- The title of the survey to which access is desired.
- A detailed discussion of the statistical research project that requires accessing the restricted NCES survey data.
- The name and title of the most senior official who has the authority to bind the organization to the provisions of the licensing agreement.
- The name and title of the project officer who will oversee the daily operations.
- The name, telephone number, and title of professional and technical staff who will access the survey database. Each professional or technical staff member with access to the data is required to sign and to have notarized an Affidavit of Nondisclosure.
- The estimated loan period necessary for accessing the NCES survey database.
- The desired computer product specifications, such as medium (9-track tape, CD-ROM), code convention (ASCII, EBCDIC, SAS), etc.

To obtain further details and a licensing agreement form please write to:

Data Security Officer
Statistical Standards and Services Group
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
National Center for Education Statistics
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Room 408
Washington, D.C. 20208
(202) 219-1831

Individuals who obtain restricted-use faculty data after signing a licensing agreement with NCES can receive the following products on one CD-ROM: the NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93 faculty data files; the NSOPF-93 institution data file; the NSOPF-93 faculty ECB, the 1993 merged faculty and institution ECB; the user's manual for the institution and restricted-use faculty data files; and the faculty and institution questionnaires.

For those individuals who do not wish to obtain a licensing agreement, a public-use faculty data file (which contains a reduced number of variables to avoid disclosure) can be ordered from the National Education Data Resource Center (see address below). The public-use institution file can also be ordered from the National Education Data Resource Center. Individuals who order the public-use faculty file on CD-ROM will receive the NSOPF-93 public-use faculty and institution data files, the institution ECB, a user's guide for the public-use faculty and institution files, and the faculty and institution questionnaires.

The DAS can be accessed also through the Internet on NCES's World Wide Web site at http://www.ed.gov/NCES. DAS procedures can be performed over the World Wide Web. The DAS CD-ROM for PC use (in DOS and Windows versions) can also be ordered by contacting:

National Education Data Resource Center
c/o Pinkerton Computer Consultants, Inc.
1900 N. Beauregard Street, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22311-1722
Phone: (703) 845-3151
FAX: (703) 820-7465
E-mail: nedrc@inet.ed .gov.

Feedback and suggestions on the products and other features of NSOPF-93 are welcome. Please address your comments to:

Linda Zimbler
NSOPF Project Officer
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
National Center for Education Statistics
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Room 422A
Washington, D.C. 20208
Phone: (202) 219-1834
E-mail: Linda_Zimbler@ed.gov

2. Data Collection Instruments

2.1 Overview

This chapter provides a brief description of the two survey instruments developed and used in NSOPF-93: the faculty questionnaire and the institution questionnaire. Both instruments were designed as self-administered questionnaires (SAQs). A CATI (computer-assisted telephone interview) version of the faculty questionnaire was also developed and used during the follow-up data collection effort. Copies of the NSOPF-93 self-administered instruments appear in Appendix F and Appendix G.

2.2 Development of Questionnaire Items

Several research and policy concerns guided questionnaire development. One of the overriding objectives was to preserve as many of the 1988 items as were relevant and feasible. But this goal had to be balanced with the need to address recent policy issues that had emerged since the previous study. In order to balance these aims, it was necessary to identify, to revise, or to eliminate some questionnaire items that were either problematic or were no longer relevant to the broader issues.

For both the field test and the full-scale study, questionnaire items were constructed based on input from several sources, including the 1988 questionnaires, other postsecondary education surveys, the NSOPF-93 National Technical Review Panel (NTRP), and project staff and consultants. Questionnaire items for the full-scale study were further revised (or deleted) based on the results of the 1992 NSOPF field test and recommendations from the NTRP.

The 1988 institution and faculty questionnaires were used as a point of departure in determining which items should initially be preserved, expanded, or revised for the NSOPF-93 field test and later for the full-scale study. One major change was the definition of faculty used in the 1993 cycle of NSOPF. While the 1988 survey collected data from full- and part-time faculty who provided instruction for credit, the 1993 sample was expanded to include non-instructional faculty, as well as instructional faculty and staff. The consensus resulting from the NTRP meetings was that the population of non-instructional personnel with faculty status was too important to exclude from the study. Deans, college and university administrators, librarians and directors of university resource centers are included in this population of non-instructional faculty.

In addition, NSOPF-93 eliminated the Departmental Chairperson survey (a major part of the 1988 cycle) in favor of larger faculty and institution samples.[2] Because the items in this survey were best addressed by the department chairperson, it was deemed advisable to incorporate only a few of the questionnaire items from this earlier survey into the NSOPF-93 faculty or institution questionnaire.

A variety of related postsecondary education studies were reviewed in the process of developing the questionnaires,[3] and some of their items were incorporated into the questionnaires for the field test and the full-scale study. Exhibits 2-1 and 2-2 describe the items in the faculty and institution questionnaires by content area and link specific questions to the 1988 instruments. Copies of the 1988 questionnaires appear in Appendices A-C.

---

[2] The final status of the department chairperson survey has not been determined for future NSOPF cycles.

[3] Institute of Social Research, York University, *The Academic Profession in Canada* (York, Ontario: Institute of Social Research, 1986); Harvard University, *1967 Survey of Faculty* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1967); Higher Education Research Institute, *1989 Faculty Survey* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, 1989); National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, *Faculty at Work: A Survey of Motivations, Expectations, and Satisfactions* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan, 1987); Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *National Survey of Faculty* (Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the

2.3 Faculty Questionnaire

The faculty questionnaire was designed to address a variety of policy-relevant issues about higher education faculty and their institutions, including: (1) the background characteristics and current activities of instructional and non-instructional faculty; (2) the supply of, and demand for, faculty in postsecondary institutions; (3) faculty as both a resource and a consumer of resources; and (4) faculty attitudes and behaviors about key aspects of the higher education environment.

Given the changed definition of faculty, questions were added about research-only and other non-instructional faculty members to an instrument that had previously sought information only about instructional faculty. The faculty questionnaire was also revised to emphasize behavioral rather than attitudinal questions in order to collect data on who the faculty are; what they do; and whether, how, and why the composition of the nation's faculty is changing. The questionnaire addressed:

- background characteristics and academic credentials;
- workloads and time allocation between classroom instruction and other activities such as research, course preparation, consulting, public service, doctoral or student advising, conferences, and curriculum development;
- compensation, and the importance of other sources of income, such as consulting fees, royalties, etc., or income-in-kind;
- roles and differences, if any, between full- and part-time faculty in their participation in institutional policy-making and planning;
- faculty attitudes toward their jobs, their institutions, higher education, and student achievement in general;
- changes in teaching methods, and the impact of new technologies on teaching techniques;
- career and retirement plans;
- differences between those who have instructional responsibilities and those who have no instructional responsibilities, such as those engaged only in research; and
- differences between those with teaching responsibilities but no faculty status and those with teaching responsibilities and faculty status.

The design of the full-scale study questionnaire required input from NCES, the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and the NSOPF-93 National Technical Review Panel (NTRP), as well as an analysis of the data collected using the field test questionnaire. Respondent comments collected during the field test were reviewed and a debriefing was held with field test interviewers.

Advancement of Teaching, 1984 and 1989).

Respondent and interviewer comments are summarized in the *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Field Test Report* [NCES 93-930]. Many questions, or subparts of questions, were deleted from the field test questionnaire based on high nonresponse or low reliability. Questions which were retained were sometimes modified to be clearer or more understandable. Some new items were added based on NTRP recommendations.

2.4 Institution Questionnaire

The institution questionnaire for the full-scale study was divided into three major sections, dealing with full-time instructional faculty and staff, part-time instructional faculty and staff, and full-time non-instructional faculty, respectively. As noted above, the inclusion of non-instructional faculty was new to NSOPF-93. Because institutional definitions of faculty vary widely, a question asked each institution for its own definitions of full- and part-time faculty, both instructional and non-instructional. The institution questionnaire obtained information on:

- the numbers of full- and part-time instructional and non-instructional faculty, as well as instructional personnel without faculty status, and their distributions by employment status (i.e. full-time, part-time) and tenure status (based on the definitions provided by the institution);
- institutional tenure policies and changes in policies on granting tenure to faculty members;
- the impact of tenure policies on the influx of new faculty and on career development;
- the growth and promotion potential for existing non-tenured junior faculty;
- the benefits and retirement plans available to faculty; and
- the turnover rates of faculty at the institution.

The institution questionnaire used in the full-scale study was quite different in content from the field test questionnaire. The results of the field test were reviewed by NCES, the NSOPF-93 NTRP and members of the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) in order to revise the questionnaire to capture as much data as possible while minimizing respondent burden. One of the major changes between the field test and the full-scale study was the elimination of items that asked for counts of minority and female faculty. Based on field test results and discussions with the NTRP, it was apparent that many institutions could not provide accurate information. Others refused to respond. In addition, the full-scale questionnaire included a glossary to highlight the operational definitions being used in the survey (e.g., instructional faculty versus non-instructional faculty) but also asked for the respondent to provide institutional definitions of permanent, temporary, full- and part-time faculty. Separate benefits questions were added for temporary full-time faculty and instructional staff. Another set of questions on institution subsidization of benefits was added as well.

Other changes between the field test and full-scale study included the addition of items asking about institutional downsizing. These items were included because of recommendations from NTRP and AIR members, and because institutions were reporting the loss of faculty due to fiscal constraints. Another recommendation of the NTRP was to collect data on the percentage of full- and part-time faculty represented by a union for purposes of collective bargaining. For more discussion of the field test, see the *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Field Test Report* [NCES 93-390].

Exhibit 2-1: NSOPF faculty questionnaire: content and linkage of items between 1988 and 1993 NSOPF cycles

Content area	NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question	Source question from NSOPF-88	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Instructional duties	1	1	
Instructional duties	1A Revised	2	**Change in order of response categories.** **New response choice:** 1. All of your instructional duties related to credit courses. **Wording changes:** Question shortened. Added: "...or advising or supervising academic activities" to response categories 2 and 3." "At least..." eliminated from response category 2.
Principal activity	2 New	3	**Question expanded**: Asks for "principal activity at this institution", and lists "sabbatical from another institution" as one of eight response categories. NSOPF-88 asks only if respondent is on sabbatical from this institution ("yes" or "no").
Faculty status	3 New		
Full-time/part-time status	4 4A New	4	**Question expanded:** A new sub-question at Q.4a asks for reasons respondent worked part-time; provides six response categories (a-f) to be answered yes or no. Change in order of response categories at Q.4 (full-time = category 1 and part-time = category 2 in 1988) to facilitate approach to Q.4a.
Responsibilities	5	7	
Year job at institution began	6 New		
Tenure status	7 Revised 7A New	9, 10	**Order of response categories changed.** **Question reformatted:** If respondent selects category 1 (tenured), then respondent answers 7A about the year tenure was achieved (Q.10 in the NSOPF-88 questionnaire).
Length of contract	8 Revised	11	**Wording changes:** Response category 3 changed from: "two or more academic/calendar years" to: "A limited number of years (i.e., two or more academic/calendar years)." "OTHER" category for open-ended answer added.
Academic rank	9 Revised	12	**Question expanded:** Asks for academic rank, title, or position. **Response category eliminated:** "Distinguished/Named Professor."
Year achieved academic rank	10	13	

Content area	**NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question**	**Source question from NSOPF-88**	**How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question**
Type of appointment	11 Revised	14	**Wording change:** From: "...Did you hold any of the following kinds of appointments at this institution?" To: "...which of the following kinds of appointments did you hold at this institution?" **New response categories:** 5. Clinical (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION). 6. Research (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION).
Principal teaching discipline	12	16	
Principal area of research	13 New		
Undergraduate academic awards	14 Revised	27	**Change in order of response categories:** Response category 6 was 0 in 1988.
Graduate financial assistance	15	28	**Change in wording in 1993:** Phrase "forms of financial assistance" added. **New response choice:** "Other loan" added to response category choices.
Academic degrees	16 Revised	26	**Response categories reordered and changed for degree code:** Categories reordered from highest to lowest degree and category "Graduate work not resulting in a degree" eliminated. **Other changes:** Name of field added. Number of degrees asked about reduced from seven to four.
Other current employment	17 Revised 17A New	5	**Wording change:** From: "Please include outside consulting or other self-owned business..." To: "... or did you also have other employment including any outside consulting or other self-owned business, or private practice?" **New question asks:** "How many different jobs, other than your employment at this institution, did you have...(WRITE IN NUMBER)"

Content area	NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question	Source question from NSOPF-88	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Main other current employment	18 Revised 18C Revised 18A New 18B New	6	**Wording changed to apply only to main other job:** From: "Other than this institution, in which of the following ways were you employed during the...Fall Term..." To: "Not counting any employment at this institution, what was the employment sector of the main other job you held during Fall 1992?" Other changes: First two NSOPF-88 response categories combined into one category; two-year or less postsecondary combined into one category; two consulting categories combined into one; two government categories combined into one. Definition of full- and part-time deleted (35 hours). Minor changes in phrasing ("On staff of" deleted from response categories). **New questions:** 18A. What year did you begin that job? 18B. What was your primary responsibility in that job? 1. Teaching 2. Research 3. Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.) 4. Clinical service 5. Community/public service 6. Administration 7. Other 18C. Was that job full-time or part-time? 1. Full-time 2. Part-time
Previous employment	19 Revised	29	**Question reformatted to pre-coded response categories.** **Wording changes:** From: "Please begin with your current job, and work backward" (up to 15 jobs) to: "the three most recent and significant main jobs that you held during the past 15 years." Added: "...at one place of employment" To: "Do not list promotions in rank...as different jobs." **Changes in response categories:** Employment sector and primary responsibility categories changed to match categories at Q.18 and Q.18B.
Presentations/ publications	20 Revised	30	**Wording changes:** NSOPF-93 response categories 1-2 refer to articles published; categories 3-4 refer to creative works; 1988 question refers to articles or creative works published for all four categories. **Added phrase:** "...Count multiple presentations/publications of the same work only once." **Format change:** Reversed response category columns to ask about total career before asking about past 2 years.

Content area	NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question	Source question from NSOPF-88	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Thesis/ dissertation committees	21 Revised	31	**Wording change:** "... or examination or certificate committees" added to question. **Changes to response categories:** Not applicable code added. **Question reformatted:** For each category, asks: A. Number served on B. Of that number, how many did you chair? **Response categories added:** Examination/certification committees. Separates categories into 3 undergraduate and 3 graduate categories.
Number of classes taught (Fall 1992)	22 New 22A New		Added to identify total classes and, or those, number for-credit.
Classroom responsibilities (for-credit)	23 Revised	32	**Question reformatted into one column per class, categories pre-coded for level and instructional methods.** **New instructions:** Main question, 1st sentence, 2nd clause shortened to "please answer the following items." Second and 3rd sentences of NSOPF-88 main question eliminated. **Added/revised response categories:** Added "CODE FOR ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF CLASS." 1st to 3rd and 6th NSOPF-88 response categories become sub-categories for NSOPF-93 Q.23(2), which has two new sub-questions, "Number of weeks the class met," and "Number of credit hours." 2nd NSOPF-88 response choice split into two sub-questions for Q.23(2), "Was this class team taught?" and "Average # hours per week you taught the class." 4th NSOPF-88 question becomes Q.23(3). NSOPF-88 primary level of students response codes 1 to 3 become 1st three sub-categories for Q.23(3). Primary level of students, codes 4 to 6, incorporated into one category at Q.23(3) "All other students." "Primary setting" item changed to "Primary instructional method used." 2nd primary setting code split into sub-categories 2 and 3 for Q.23(4) "Seminar" and "discussion group or class presentation." Primary setting response codes 7 and 8 replaced with new categories "Group projects" and "Cooperative learning groups."
Undergraduate courses taught for credit/tools and methodology used	24 New 24a New		

Content area	NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question	Source question from NSOPF-88	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Individual instruction	25 Revised	33	**Wording change:** Additional definitions offered in text: "independent study or one-on-one instruction, including working with student in a clinical or research setting" Additional instructions: "Do not count regularly scheduled office hours." **Response categories:** Multiple response categories collapsed into "all other students."
Weekly scheduled office hours	26 New		
Informal student contact	27 New		
Research/creative works	28 New		
Primary research/creative work	29 New		
Any funded research/creative work	30 New		
PI or Co-PI: funded research/ creative work	31 Revised	34	**Wording change:** "principal investigator (PI) or project director" changed to "principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (Co-PI)" phrase deleted: "...including service contracts or internal awards"
Individuals supported by funded research/creative work	32 New		
Funded research/creative work	33 Revised	35	**Question introduction changed.** 1988 question asked about grants and contracts for which respondent was principal investigator. 1993 questionnaire asks about all grants and contracts for which respondent was a principal investigator, a Co-PI or a staff member. **Question expanded (Parts C and E are new):** A. Funding source (re-ordered) B. Number of grants/contracts C. Work done as... 1. PI 2. Co-PI 3. Staff D. Total funds for 1992-93 academic year E. How funds were used... 1. Research 2. Program/curriculum development 3. Other
Quality of available resources	34 New		
Internal funds for professional development	35 New		

Content area	NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question	Source question from NSOPF-88	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Faculty activities/ workload	36 Revised	36	**Wording changes:** "work" replaced by "activities" **Category added:** Paid activities at institution asked separately from unpaid activities at institution. Number of categories expanded from three to four.
Faculty activities/ workload	37 Revised 37A Revised 37B New	37	**Wording change:** From: "Please estimate the percentage of your total working hours ...spent on each of the following activities..." To: "In column A we ask you to allocate your total work time ...into several categories." **New instructions added:** "We realize they are not mutually exclusive categories..." **Instruction change:** "We know that this is tedious..." deleted from request that percentages add up to 100% of total time. **Change in response categories, question added, questions reformatted:** Two responses asked for each category: A. % of Work Time Spent, B. % of Work Time Preferred. a. Teaching (incorporates 1st 3 categories from NSOPF-88). b. Research (incorporates 5th to 7th NSOPF-88 categories). c. Professional Growth (incorporates 8th and 9th NSOPF-88 categories d. Administration (matches 4th 1988 category). e. Outside consulting or freelance work (matches 11th 1988 category). f. Service/Other Non-Teaching Activities (incorporates 10th, 12th and 13th NSOPF-88 categories).
Union membership	38 Revised	17,18	**Response categories expanded, two questions combined into one:** 1. Union is available, but I am not eligible. 2. I am eligible, but not a member. 3. I am eligible, and a member. 4. Union is not available at this institution.
Job satisfaction	39 Revised 40 Revised	19	**Wording changes:** Replaced "do you personally feel about" with "How satisfied or dissatisfied...?" at Q.39, changed "your job" to "your instructional duties." **Category changes:** Q.39 asks about six instructional duties categories and Q.40 asks about nine general job satisfaction categories. Some categories were modified or deleted, and new categories added. NSOPF-88 had 29 categories.

Content area	NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question	Source question from NSOPF-88	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Faculty mobility	41 Revised	20	**Wording change:** From: "How likely is it you will leave this job to do the following" To: "How likely is it that you will leave this job to..." **Categories modified/added/reordered:** "Seek or accept" changed to "accept." Two categories added to differentiate "...postsecondary institution" from "...not at a postsecondary institution." Retirement asked about last, instead of first.
Faculty retirement age	42 Revised	24	Question reformatted to ask for verbatim response to age respondent expects to retire.
Job satisfaction: Reasons for accepting new position	43 Revised	22	**Wording change:** From: "this job" To: "your current position in academia." "...inside or outside of academia" added after "to accept another position." **Category changes:** Some categories were reordered, six were deleted and three were added.
Retirement options	44 New 45 New		
Projected age of retirement	46 New		
Compensation from institution	47 Revised	40	**Wording changes:** "Earnings" is replaced by "compensation." Response category headers replace "Income" with "Compensation." **Changes to response categories:** "Other sources of earned income" becomes a header. Two response categories added for verbatim responses. b. Type of appointment (e.g., 9 months) added. Instruction added to non-monetary compensation items: "Do not include employee benefits, such as medical, dental, or life insurance."
Household enumeration	48 New		
Total household income	49 New		
Number of dependents	50 New		
Sex (male/female)	51 Revised	41	NSOPF-88 asks "Your gender" and NSOPF-93 question asks "Are you..." with response categories
Date of birth	52 Revised	42	**Wording change:** From: "In what year were you born?" To: "In what month and year were you born?"
Race/ethnicity	53	44	"African-American/black" replaces "black."
Race/ethnicity	53A New	44	Added to allow categorization of Asian/Pacific Islander ethnic groups.

Content area	NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire question	Source question from NSOPF-88	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Race/ethnicity	54	43	
Race/ethnicity	54A New	43	Added to allow categorization of Hispanic ethnic groups.
Current marital status	55 Revised	45	**Response category added:** "Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship."
Country of birth	56 New		
Citizenship status	57 Revised	46	**Wording changes** **From:** "Of what country are you currently a citizen?" **To:** "What is your citizenship status?" **Question reformatted:** 1. United States citizen, native, 2. United States citizen, naturalized, 3. Permanent resident of the United States (immigrant visa), 4. Temporary resident of United States (non-immigrant visa). Categories 3 and 4 each ask for country of present citizenship.
Parents' education	58 Revised	47	Revised question does not ask about spouse.
Academic interests and values	59 Revised 60 Revised	48 49	**Category changes:** Some categories were modified or deleted, and new categories were added. Categories also reordered. Five of the 1988 categories were retained at Q.59 and eight were deleted; two new categories were added. Four of the 1988 categories were retained at Q.60 and two were deleted; five new categories were added.

Exhibit 2-2: NSOPF institution questionnaire: content and linkage of items between 1988 and 1993 NSOPF cycles

Content area	NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire question	Source question from 1988 institution questionnaire	Source question from 1988 department questionnaire	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Institutional definitions of faculty	New			
Numbers of full/part-time faculty/staff, Fall 1992	1 Revised	4,5,19		Combined questions from NSOPF-88 into one question. Omitted asking specifically for "full-time faculty with visiting, acting, or adjunct appointments"
Section I: Full-time instructional faculty/staff Changes in total of permanent staff 1991-92	2 Revised	6		**Wording changes:** From: "How many full-time instructional faculty did your institution have in each of the following categories?" To: "Please provide the following information about changes in the number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff between the 1991 and 1992 Fall Terms." **Change in response categories:** Reordered sub-items, added "d. Number...who left because of downsizing..."
Number of permanent staff institution sought to hire	3 Revised		13	**Wording change:** From: "For how many unfilled full-time instructional faculty positions in your department were candidates being hired?" To: "How many permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff did your institution seek to hire for the 1992 Fall Term?"
Number of permanent instructional positions not filled	4, 4A New			
Tenure system	5 Revised	3		Deleted "for any of your"
Number of tenured/tenure track staff 1991/1992	6 Revised	8	9	Reformatted answer matrix
Number of tenured staff who left between 1991-92	7 Revised	9	10	Slight change in question wording. **Change in response categories:** Deleted "to assume another position," "formally removed for cause," and "dismissed because of institutional budget pressures or program closure" Added "downsizing"
Number of staff considered for/granted tenure	8	7	8	

Content area	**NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire question**		**Source question from 1988 institution questionnaire**	**Source question from 1988 department questionnaire**	**How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question**
Maximum number of years on tenure track	9	Revised	10, 12	11	**Wording change:** From: "Is there a maximum number of years an instructional faculty member can be on tenure track and not receive tenure at your institution?" To: "Fill in the following information about the maximum number of years..." **Change in response categories:** Added "9b. If maximum number of years has changed..." from NSOPF-88 question 12.
Changes in tenure policy in last 5 years	10	Revised	12		**Change in question wording:** From "three years" to "five years" **Change in response categories:** Deleted "offered optional early or phased retirement"; asked separately in question 11. Deleted "changed the upper limit on the percentage of full-time faculty who may be tenured" and "changed the maximum number of years a person can be on tenure track..."
Early or phased retirement policy (permanent staff)	11	Revised	12		See note for question 10.
Retirement plans available to permanent staff	12	Revised	15		Reformatted question wording slightly; deleted asking for approximate number of faculty participants; reformatted response matrix **Change in response categories:** Reordered categories, added "b. Other 403B plan" and changed "d. 401K or 401B plan" from "401(k) or 403(b) plan"
Employee benefits (permanent staff)	13	Revised	14, 16		**Changes in question wording:** Added "permanent" to question, added "If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution." **Change in response categories:** Reordered categories, added k. Transportation/parking n. Medical insurance for retirees o. Cafeteria-style plan...
Percent of salary contributed to benefits by institution	14	Revised	17		**Changes in question wording:** Added "permanent" to question text
Availability of benefits to temporary faculty	15	*New	14		**Changes in question wording:** Added "temporary" to question text

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Content area	NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire question	Source question from 1988 institution questionnaire	Source question from 1988 department questionnaire	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Employee benefits (temporary faculty)	16 *New	14		See changes for question 13; added "temporary" in question text
Percent of undergraduate instruction by full-time staff	17 New			
Teacher assessment	18 Revised		19	**Changes in question wording:** From: "In which of the following ways, if any, is the teaching performance of full-time faculty assessed in your department?" To: "Are any of the following used in assessing teaching performance of full-time (permanent or temporary) instructional faculty/staff at this institution?" **Change in response categories:** Changed c. from "student placement or honors" to "student career placement"
Collective bargaining	19, 19A	13	17	**Changes in question wording:** Added "with this institution"
Section II: Full-time non-instructional faculty Changes in total of permanent staff 1991/92	20 *New	6		See note for question 2
Tenure system	21 *New	3		See note for question 5
Number of tenured/ tenure track staff 1991/1992	22 *New	8	9	See note for question 6
Number of tenured staff who left between 1991-92	23 *New	9	10	See note for question 7
Number considered for/granted tenure	24 *New	7	8	See note for question 8
Maximum number of years on tenure track	25 *New	10	11	See note for question 9
Changes in tenure policy in last 5 years	26 *New	12		See note for question 10
Early or phased retirement policy (permanent staff)	27 *New	12		See note for question 11
Retirement plans available to permanent staff	28 *New	15		See note for question 12
Employee benefits (permanent staff)	29 *New	14		See note for question 13

Content area	NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire question	Source question from 1988 institution questionnaire	Source question from 1988 department questionnaire	How NSOPF-93 question differs from NSOPF-88 question
Percent of salary contributed to benefits by institution	30 *New	17		See note for question 14
Availability of benefits to temporary faculty	31 *New	14		See note for question 15
Employee benefits (temporary faculty)	32 *New	14		See note for question 16
Collective bargaining	33,33A *New	13	17	See note for question 19, 19A
Section III: Part-time instructional faculty/staff				
Availability of retirement plans	34 New			
Retirement plans: subsidized/nonsubsidized	35 Revised	23		See note for question 12
Employee benefits	36 New			
Employee benefits available	37 *New	24,14		See note for question 13 Also added p. "other"
Percent of salary contributed to benefits by institution	38 Revised	25		Question wording slightly revised
Eligibility criteria for benefits	39 New			
Eligibility requirements for benefits	40 New			
Percent of undergraduate instruction by part-time staff	41 New			
Teacher assessment	42 Revised		32	See note for question 18
Collective bargaining	43, 43A	22	29	See note for question 19, 19A

* Not asked in 1988 for this faculty type though asked for other types

3. Sample Design and Implementation

This chapter describes the sample design and procedures used for selecting institutions and faculty for NSOPF-93. It also provides information on the calculation of sample weights and the relative efficiency of the sample design.

3.1 NSOPF-93 Sample Design

NSOPF-93 sought to create a nationally representative sample of instructional faculty and staff and non-instructional faculty at two-year and above, non-proprietary or public postsecondary institutions. To achieve this, a two-stage sample design was used, with a sample of 974 postsecondary institutions in the first stage, and a sample of 31,354 faculty from these institutions in the second stage.

3.2 Institution Universe

The definition of the institution universe for NSOPF-93 was identical to the one used in NSOPF-88. It was defined as those institutions in the traditional sector of postsecondary education whose accreditation at the college level is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Institutions were selected from the IPEDS universe into the NSOPF-93 institution frame if they:

- were classified as two-year, four-year (and above), or doctoral-granting institutions;
- were public or private nonprofit;
- offered an educational program designed for persons who have earned a traditional four-year high school diploma or a high school graduate equivalency diploma;
- offered programs that are academically, occupationally, or vocationally oriented;
- made programs available to persons other than those employed by the institution;
- offered some courses other than correspondence courses; and
- were located in the 50 states or the District of Columbia.

Institutions were excluded from the universe if they:

- were not recognized as accredited at the college level by the U.S. Department of Education;
- were classified as for-profit, or less-than-two-year institutions;
- provided only avocational, recreational, basic adult education, or remedial courses (e.g., driver training schools, real estate courses, dance schools, tax preparation schools, and the like);
- provided only in-house business courses or training; and
- were not located in the 50 states or the District of Columbia.

3.3 Faculty Universe

Unlike NSOPF-88, which was limited to instructional faculty, the faculty universe for NSOPF-93 was expanded to include all who were designated as faculty, whether or not their responsibilities included for-credit instruction. Under this definition, researchers and administrators and other institutional staff who held faculty positions, but who did not instruct, were included in the sample. Instructional staff without faculty status were also included. Teaching assistants and teaching fellows were excluded in both NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93. In instructions for preparing lists from which the NSOPF-93 faculty sample was drawn, institutions were asked to use the following eligibility criteria to determine which faculty members to include on the lists.

Eligibility criteria for faculty. The eligible universe of postsecondary faculty was defined to include:

- full- and part-time personnel whose regular assignment included instruction;
- full- and part-time individuals with faculty status whose regular assignment did not include instruction;
- permanent and temporary personnel with any instructional duties, including adjunct, acting, or visiting status; and
- faculty and instructional personnel on sabbatical leave.

Excluded from the NSOPF-93 universe of faculty were:

- faculty and other personnel with instructional duties outside the U.S. (but not on sabbatical leave);
- temporary replacements for faculty and other instructional personnel;
- faculty and other instructional and non-instructional personnel on leave without pay;
- graduate teaching assistants;
- military personnel who taught only ROTC courses; and
- instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors.

3.4 Sampling Frame

An explicit or an implicit list of the elements to be sampled can be used in designing a sampling frame. Creating an explicit list of all faculty and staff working at every institution in the frame of eligible institutions would have been an impossible task. Therefore, NCES elected to use an implicit list of faculty—a comprehensive list of faculty constructed from lists provided by the *sampled* postsecondary institutions. This list of faculty from sampled institutions needed to be comprehensive, accurate, and able to provide complete data for variables to be used in the subsequent stratification of the faculty sampling list.

The most appropriate and readily accessible source for a complete and accurate frame of institutions is the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS),[4] a recurring set of surveys developed and maintained by NCES. IPEDS defines postsecondary education as "the provision of a formal instructional program whose curriculum is designed primarily for students who have completed the requirements for a high school diploma or its equivalent." This includes programs whose purpose is academic, vocational, and continuing professional education, and excludes avocational and adult basic education. IPEDS encompasses all institutional providers of postsecondary education in the United States and its outlying areas. The final IPEDS universe for 1991-92 consisted of 10,144 known entities: 4,390 nonproprietary or public higher education (two-year and four-year) institutions, 932 proprietary higher education institutions, and 4,822 less than two-year institutions. The NSOPF sample frame was drawn from IPEDS higher education nonproprietary or public institutions, following the institutional eligibility criteria described above. After eliminating 1,077 unaccredited nonproprietary or public higher education institutions and an additional 57 accredited nonproprietary or public higher education institutions located outside of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, the first-stage NSOPF-93 sampling frame was limited to a subset of 3,256 1991-92 IPEDS institutions: all accredited nonproprietary or public higher education institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The NSOPF-93 universe of institutions was stratified using a modified Carnegie classification system,[5] based on the highest degree institutions offer and the amount of federal research dollars they receive. For NSOPF-93, there were two levels of control, public and private, and nine types of institutions, based on 1987 Carnegie classifications, as follows:

- *Research universities* : This is a combination of the categories Research Universities I and II. Carnegie defines Research Universities I as those institutions which "offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate degree, and give high priority to research. They receive annually $33.5 million or more in federal support and award at least 50 or more doctoral degrees each year." The definition of Research Universities II is identical to that of Research Universities I except for the condition that "they receive annually between $12.5 million and $33.5 million in federal support for research and development . . ."

- *Other Ph.D.*: This is a combination of the categories Doctorate-Granting Universities I and II. Doctorate-Granting Universities I is defined as including institutions "offering a full range of baccalaureate programs [and] the mission of these institutions includes a commitment to graduate education through the doctorate degree. They award at least 40 Ph.D. degrees annually in five or more disciplines." The definition of Doctorate-Granting Universities II is identical to that of Doctorate-Granting Universities I, except that these institutions "award annually 20 or more Ph.D. degrees in at least one discipline or 10 or more Ph.D. degrees in three or more disciplines."

---

[4] For more information on IPEDS data used in this study, see National Center for Education Statistics, *IPEDS Manual for Users* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1991 [NCES 95-724]). This manual is also distributed with IPEDS data on CD-ROM.

[5] See *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Princeton, N.J., 1987), pp. 7-8.

- *Comprehensive colleges and universities*: Offer liberal arts and professional programs. Master's degrees are the highest degrees offered. This is a combination of the categories Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I and II. Carnegie defines Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I as institutions that "offer baccalaureate programs and, with few exceptions, graduate education through the master's degree. More than half of their baccalaureate degrees are awarded in two or more occupational or professional disciplines such as engineering or business administration. All of the institutions in this group enroll at least 2,500 students." The definition of Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II is identical to that of Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I, except for the qualification that they enroll between 1,500 and 2,500 students.

- *Liberal arts colleges*: Smaller and generally more selective than comprehensive colleges and universities. Primarily offer bachelor's degrees, although some offer master's degrees. This definition combines the categories Liberal Arts Colleges I and II. Carnegie defines Liberal Arts Colleges I as "primarily undergraduate colleges that award more than half of their baccalaureate degrees in arts and science fields." The definition of Liberal Arts Colleges II is identical to Liberal Arts Colleges I, except it also "includes a group of colleges that award *less* than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields but, with fewer than 1,500 students, are too small to be considered comprehensive."

- *Independent medical schools*: Those not considered as part of a four-year college or university. Includes medical schools and medical centers.

- *Religious colleges*: Includes theological seminaries, bible colleges, and other institutions offering degrees in religion. There are no public religious colleges in the U.S.

- *Non-profit, two-year colleges*: Offer certificate or degree programs through the Associate of Arts level and with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.

- *Other*: A wide range of professional and other specialized degree-granting colleges and universities. Includes other separate health professional schools, schools of law, schools of engineering and technology, schools of business and management, schools of art, music, and design, teachers colleges, and other specialized schools.

- *Unknown*: Carnegie classification was unknown at the time of sample selection.

Exhibit 3-1 compares the 1993 and 1988 NSOPF sample designs. It also provides a comparison with the 1991-92 IPEDS frame used for NSOPF-93.

Exhibit 3-1: Institutional sample
1988 design, 1993 design, and NSOPF-93 frame

Institution type	**Total**		
	1988 design	**1993 design**	**NSOPF-93 frame****
Research*	70	104	104
Percent of sample	14.6	10.7	
Percent of frame	67.3	100.0	3.2
Other Ph.D.- granting*	50	109	109
Percent of sample	10.4	11.2	
Percent of frame	45.9	100.0	3.3
Comprehensive	115	242	578
Percent of sample	24.0	24.8	
Percent of frame	19.9	41.9	17.8
Liberal arts	40	71	578
Percent of sample	8.3	7.3	
Percent of frame	6.9	12.3	17.8
Medical	20	35	52
Percent of sample	4.2	3.6	
Percent of frame	38.5	67.3	1.6
Religious	20	20	309
Percent of sample	4.2	2.0	
Percent of frame	6.5	6.5	9.5
Two-year	120	329	1,107
Percent of sample	25.0	33.8	
Percent of frame	10.8	29.7	34.0
Other	45	33	222
Percent of sample	9.4	3.4	
Percent of frame	20.3	14.9	6.8
Unknown	0	31	197
Percent of sample	0.0	3.2	
Percent of frame	0.0	15.7	6.0
Total	480	974	3,256
Percent of sample	100.0	100.0	
Percent of 1993 frame	14.7	29.9	100.0

* All institutions in the "research" stratum were selected with certainty. The "other Ph.D.-granting" stratum represented 100 percent of the frame because: 1) all public doctoral granting institutions were selected with certainty, and 2) all private doctoral granting universities were selected in the initial sample or added to the sample later when 185 supplemental institutions were selected to compensate for institutions determined to be ineligible or for institutions that were unlikely to participate in the study. See sections 3.6 and 3.7 for further discussion.

** Represents a subset of the IPEDS universe. Only those higher education IPEDS institutions that are nonproprietary, are located in the 50 states or the District of Columbia, and are accredited by the U.S. Department of Education were included in the frame.

3.5 First Stage Sampling: Institution-Level

At the time of sample selection, 278 (8.5 percent) of the 3,256 institutions in the sample frame could not be classified using the 1987-88 Carnegie crosswalk file. Updates were supplied for 81 of these institutions by Carnegie staff, leaving 197 institutions unclassified. This remaining group of unclassified institutions was designated as "unknown" in the sample frame. In addition, NCES requested that 25 institutions be transferred from the "Other" Carnegie classification into "Liberal Arts." These institutions included Teachers' Colleges (Carnegie code=58) and Schools of Art, Music, and Design (Carnegie code=56) whose highest level of offering was a Bachelor's degree. This adjustment was made under the assumption that these institutions more closely approximated Liberal Arts colleges than other specialized schools.

Institutions were stratified according to a cross-classification of control by type. There were two levels of control, public and private, and nine types, as discussed in section 3.4: research, other Ph.D., comprehensive, liberal arts, medical, religious, two-year institutions, other, and unknown. Since there are no public religious institutions, the cross-classification has 17 cells. The desired sampling rates for three of the cells, public research, private research, and public "other Ph.D.," were so close to 100 percent that it was appropriate to sample all of the institutions in those cells. A separate sampling stratum was constructed for these institutions, "stratum 15"; all institutions in this stratum were selected (i.e. selected with certainty). Grouping the institutions together in stratum 15 makes sense from a sampling design and selection standpoint, although this stratum does not comprise a grouping of analytical interest. Institutions in the other 14 strata are referred to as noncertainty institutions. The 15 sampling strata are described below:

Stratum 1 = Private, other Ph.D.
Stratum 2 = Public, comprehensive
Stratum 3 = Private, comprehensive
Stratum 4 = Public, liberal arts
Stratum 5 = Private, liberal arts
Stratum 6 = Public, medical
Stratum 7 = Private, medical
Stratum 8 = Private, religious
Stratum 9 = Public, two-year
Stratum 10 = Private, two-year
Stratum 11 = Public, other
Stratum 12 = Private, other
Stratum 13 = Public, unknown
Stratum 14 = Private, unknown
Stratum 15 includes all Public, research; Private, research; Public, other Ph.D. institutions

The stratum sample sizes for the noncertainty institutions, determined by a preliminary pass through the 14 strata, were allocated proportional to the total estimated number of faculty and instructional staff in each stratum. In those strata, the first-stage selections were made using stratified sampling with probabilities within each stratum proportional to the expected numbers of faculty and instructional staff. Various combinations of first-stage (institution) sampling rates and second-stage (faculty) sampling rates may be used to achieve equal selection probabilities for faculty. However, under reasonable assumptions, such as constant intraclass correlation within institutions in a stratum, setting first-stage probabilities proportional to the number of faculty in the institution and choosing a constant sized cluster of faculty from each selected institution is optimal in the sense of minimizing variance of sample means.

The sampling requirements for NSOPF-93 were developed using a dynamic standard error model that simulated various sampling scenarios at the institution and faculty levels. After numerous simulations of the model were performed, it was determined that acceptable levels of precision for most faculty subgroups could be obtained with an institutional sample of 789 institutions. To meet the study's analytical objectives, the sample design also required oversampling certain subgroups of faculty including: full-time females; black, non-Hispanics and Hispanics; Asian/Pacific Islanders; and faculty in four disciplines of particular interest (philosophy/religion, foreign languages, English language and literature, and history). An average cluster size of 41.5 faculty was targeted for each. Systematic probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling with a measure of size (MOS) equal to 41 or the estimated number of faculty, whichever was larger, was used to select institutions.

MOS was defined as the total number of faculty as specified in the most recent IPEDS available at the time (the 1991 Fall Staff survey). Of the 3,256 institutions listed on the sample frame, 3,106 had a MOS available. For the remaining 150 (4.6 percent) institutions for which faculty data were missing, MOS was imputed using one of two methods. After imputation, the MOS was available for each institution in the frame, whether selected or not.

The first imputation method involved 123 of the 150 institutions for which only student enrollment data were available from the most recent IPEDS file. A student-faculty (S-F) ratio was first calculated for the 3,106 institutions for which information on both variables was available. The S-F ratio was then arrayed by type and control for these institutions. A MOS for the 123 institutions was determined using the following formula: (number of students)/(S-F ratio for that institution's cell). The second method of imputation involved the 27 remaining institutions for which neither student nor faculty enrollment data were available. The average number of faculty for the 3,106 institutions was calculated by type and control and the 27 institutions were given an imputed MOS based on the average number of faculty for their respective cells.

In systematic sampling, the order in which the institutions are listed on the frame is important because it reflects an implicit stratification. Within each stratum the institutions were sorted by MOS in a "serpentine" manner, i.e., if one stratum was sorted in ascending order by MOS, the next was sorted in descending order, the one after that was sorted in ascending order, and so on. This procedure helped to balance the sample with respect to institution size (based on number of faculty). A total of 789 institutions was initially selected and later supplemented with 185 institutions for a total of 974 selected in the first stage (see section 3.6 below).

Institutions were selected in two replicates. The first replicate, "Pool 1," contained the initial sample of 789 noncertainty and certainty institutions. The second replicate, "Pool 2," was sorted into random order within strata and contained 606 noncertainty institutions. Pool 2 provided a source of institutions available so that like institutions could be selected to replace nonparticipating Pool 1 institutions.

3.6 Institution Nonresponse

Nonresponse is likely to increase sample variance by causing departures from strict PPS selection. Nonresponse is also likely to cause some bias, the extent of which is difficult to measure. Nonresponse rates were used to serve as simple indicators of the magnitude of nonresponse.[6] Institutions that were determined ineligible or which could not be recruited after extensive follow-up were replaced at random by institutions within the same explicit stratum in Pool 2.[7] Since, by definition, all institutions in stratum 15 were selected, they did not have replacements within stratum 15.

However, research institution non-participation posed a problem with attaining sufficient samples of some of the important faculty groups targeted for oversampling. Thus, a decision was made to include additional institutions from similar strata. "Private, other Ph.D.," "Public comprehensive" and "Private comprehensive" sampling strata were used for this purpose. Sixteen nonresponding certainty institutions were compensated for in this manner. More on nonresponse rates can be found in Chapters 4 and 7.

---

[6] Nonresponse rates were calculated separately for Pool 1 selections and for the combined selections from Pool 1 and Pool 2 (excluding nonselections from Pool 2).

[7] The first replicate, "Pool 1," contained the original sample. If 100 percent response could be achieved, the second replicate, "Pool 2," would not have been used at all. The response rate was not 100 percent, however. Pool 2 was sorted into random order within stratum. When a nonresponse was encountered in stratum x ($1 \leq x \leq 14$) in Pool 1, the first nonselected institution from stratum x in Pool 2 was selected as a replacement institution.

The sampling plan assumed an institutional participation rate of 95 percent and a faculty response rate of 85 percent, for a yield of approximately 750 institutions and 27,750 faculty. However, the final institution participation rate (i.e., provided faculty lists) was 85 percent, based on the total institution sample (the original sample plus 185 supplemental institutions). The lower-than-anticipated institutional participation rate did not, however, noticeably hamper the representativeness of the sample. NCES performed a discriminant analysis comparing faculty characteristics reported on a sample of the NSOPF-93 faculty sampling lists with the faculty characteristics detailed in the IPEDS universe. The analysis showed no significant differences between the NSOPF-93 sampling lists and the IPEDS universe.

3.7 Institution Replacements

Based largely on the field test experience, it was initially anticipated that 20 to 25 percent of the sampled institutions would ultimately refuse to participate in the full-scale study. Between October 1992 and early March 1993, 26 institutions in the original sample were replaced by randomly selected comparable institutions (from Pool 2): five because they were ineligible and 21 because they were determined to be final refusals. After trying to gain cooperation from the initial sample of 789 institutions for almost six months, it was determined that a certain number of other institutions were unlikely to participate in the study. These institutions were identified in March 1993 and 159 additional institutions were randomly selected within the relevant strata (from Pool 2). Thus, a total of 185 institutions, equivalent to 23 percent of the initial sample (n=789), was selected to compensate for institutions determined to be ineligible or for institutions that were unlikely to participate in the study. Replacement selections were made to achieve two objectives: to assure adequate representation across strata, and to achieve an institution participation rate of 85 percent. Project staff tried to gain cooperation from both the original and replacement samples simultaneously. The final participation rate for list collection was 85 percent for both the original sample and the additional sample.

Typically, an institution that initially refused to participate was recontacted by key members of the project staff, usually by one of the project supervisors. After determining the reasons for their refusal, a specific plan was proposed to respond to the institution's concerns. In some instances, this meant providing compensation to prepare the list; in other instances, it required accepting a list without some of the requested sampling or address information. If the proposed plan proved unacceptable to the institution, other senior members of the project staff or the NCES project officer recontacted the institution to try once again to win their participation. If following these repeated attempts the institution still decided not to participate, the institution was considered a final refusal.

3.8 Second Stage Sampling: Faculty-Level

At the second stage of sample selection, the NSOPF-93 sampling frame consisted of lists of faculty and instructional staff obtained from 817 participating institutions. The sampling of faculty was handled by a multi-step program developed specifically for NSOPF-93. The program was designed to ensure the adequate representation in the sample of particular faculty groups, according to NSF and NEH analytical objectives. These faculty groups were: full-time females; black, non-Hispanics and Hispanics; Asian/Pacific Islanders; and faculty in four NEH-designated disciplines: philosophy/religion, foreign languages, English language and literature, and history. The sampling program proceeded through the following steps in sampling an institution's faculty:

(1) Each institution was randomly assigned a target total sample size, say *n*, of either 41 or 42 to yield the desired average cluster size of 41.5. Whenever an institution employed fewer than 42 individuals, all faculty were selected.

(2) Depending on the composition of an institution's faculty, the program oversampled to achieve the following average oversample sizes[8] per institution:

Black, non-Hispanic/Hispanic	5.6081
Full-time female	3.3649
Faculty in NEH disciplines	2.2432
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.1216
None of the above	0.0000 (no oversampling)

The oversample sizes in each institution were randomly rounded to integers; the rounding was independent across institutions.

(3) Some faculty belonged to more than one of the oversampled groups—termed "multi-group" members. For example, a full-time faculty member who was a Hispanic female would belong to two of the groups. To use stratified sampling to select the faculty, it was necessary to classify each faculty member into just one of the groups. Once this was accomplished, the groups would be exhaustive and mutually exclusive and hence they would be true strata. Although simple randomization could have been used to assign multi-group members to a single group, alternative methods of assignment can lead to more efficient samples. Thus, it was decided to make the assignments so as to minimize the oversampling rates.[9] Specifically, the faculty lists were processed sequentially, so that in a given institution a multi-group member was assigned to the group for which the oversampling rate (defined as the oversample size divided by the number of individuals in that institution which could qualify for the group) was largest. As the program proceeded through the list, the oversampling rates varied depending on how many multi-group members there were and how they were classified into single groups. At the end of this step, each faculty member was classified into one group. The oversample size for each group was then checked to ensure that it did not exceed the number of members of the group; any oversample sizes that did were reduced accordingly.

(4) The final sampling rate for a group was set equal to the sum of the oversampling rate and the rate that would have been used if no oversampling was done. Using these final sampling rates, stratified sampling was performed with the groups as strata.

(5) The residual sample size (*n* minus the sum of the oversample sizes) was allocated across the five strata in proportion to the number of faculty in the strata. Then the total sample in each stratum (consisting of the oversample size plus the proportionally allocated residual) was specified by simple random sampling without replacement, with the sampling independent from one faculty stratum to the next.

---

[8] The oversample size for a group is the difference between the expected sample size for the group and the expected sample size that would have been attained if all faculty had been sampled at the same rate, i.e., in the absence of oversampling.

[9] The oversampling rate is the ratio of the oversample size to the size of the group. Increasing the size of the group decreases the oversampling rate. The lower the oversampling rate, the smaller the design effect due to unequal weighting. Oversample sizes were not affected.

Among the 789 initial sample institutions, it was determined that 48 (6.1 percent) institutions overlapped with the NSOPF-93 field test sample. Six of the institutions from the replacement pool also overlapped with the field test sample for a combined overlap (initial and replacement) of 54 institutions or 5.5 percent of the 974 selections. Faculty who were selected into both the field test and the full-scale study samples were excluded from the latter in accordance with OMB requirements.

3.9 Subsampling of Faculty

As a cost-saving measure, 2,000 faculty were subsampled from the overall sample of faculty in August, 1993. This reduced the sample size for the NSOPF-93 faculty sample from 33,354 to 31,354. These faculty were subsampled at random. First, all completed cases were excluded from the subsample. Second, all remaining cases were assigned a "wave" indicator, taking integer values from 1 to 6, indicating which of the six survey waves the case belonged to. Because all faculty in any institution belonged to the same wave, subsampling then proceeded according to the following specifications. (For further explanation of the fielding of the faculty survey in waves, see section 5.3.)

For wave j, let N_j denote the number of faculty selected, let n_j denote the number of faculty cases completed, and let $A_j = N_j - n_j$ denote the number of cases not yet completed. Let A_+ denote the sum of the A_j terms, i.e., $A_+ = A_1 + A_2 + \ldots + A_6$. Subsampling proceeded in two steps. First the number of cases to be excluded (subsampled out) of wave j, say m_j, was calculated. Second, these cases were subsampled out.

Set $m_j = 2000(A_j / A_+)$ for each wave j. For each wave j, $1 \leq j \leq 6$, A_j noncompleted cases from wave j were sorted by institution. Thus, all faculty in an institution appeared consecutively in the file. Then a random start was chosen and systematic sampling taking every kth record from stratum j was performed. This yielded a sample of m_j records. These cases were removed from the sample.

The $A_j - m_j$ cases in wave j that were not excluded by this sampling received a flag indicating that they were eligible for exclusion at this point but were not excluded. Their raw sampling weights were inflated by a factor equal to $1/(1 - m_j/A_j)$.

3.10 Calculation of Weights

The sample was weighted to produce national estimates of institutions and faculty by using weights designed to adjust for differential probabilities of selection and nonresponse at the institution and faculty levels. After excluding ineligible institutions from the institution sample, the adjusted weights for institutions sum to 3,188.[10] Likewise, after excluding ineligible members from the faculty sample, the adjusted weights for faculty sum to 1,033,966, the estimated total number of faculty in the target population. This number includes instructional staff who did not have faculty status and whose instructional duties related only to noncredit courses or advising, or to supervising noncredit academic activities.

Three weights were computed for the NSOPF-93 sample: a first-stage institution-level weight and final institution and faculty weights. The first-stage institution-level weights accounted for the institutions that participated in the study by submitting a faculty sampling list and permitted faculty members to be sampled. The two final weights—weights for the sample faculty, and institution-level weights for those institutions that returned institution questionnaires—were adjusted for nonresponse. The final faculty weights were poststratified to the "best" estimates of the number of faculty.

---

[10] Twelve institutions in the sample were found to be ineligible. When ineligible institutions were excluded from the sample, the sum of weights for eligible institutions was 3,188, rather than the 3,256 institutions specified in the sampling frame.

A poststratification adjustment to the IPEDS population was not calculated. The IPEDS and NSOPF-93 faculty population definitions and estimates, although similar in many respects, are not identical nor are they intended to correspond directly. IPEDS defines as Faculty (Instruction/Research) "all persons whose specific assignments customarily are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research or public service as a principle activity (or activities) and who hold academic-rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, or the equivalent of any of these academic ranks. If their principle activity is instructional [this category also includes] deans, directors, or the equivalent, as well as associate deans, assistant deans and executive officers of academic departments . . ." While NSOPF-93's definition of instructional faculty parallels the IPEDS definition, many of the job titles that NSOPF considers non-instructional faculty are classified in IPEDS under other non-faculty categories. For example, in its instructions to IPEDS respondents, NCES lists "librarians" as an example of a "Professional Non-Faculty" position. Yet, NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire respondents listed "librarians" as the largest single group of non-instructional *faculty*. Because of such definitional differences between the NSOPF and IPEDS populations, a poststratification adjustment to IPEDS estimates was ruled out.

3.11 First-Stage Institution Weights

The first-stage institution weights for the NSOPF-93 faculty survey were constructed in three steps. First, the institution's base weight was calculated as the reciprocal of its selection probability. Second, the initial base weights were adjusted for institutions that had merged and so were effectively listed multiple times in the sampling frame. Finally, nonresponse adjustment factors were applied to the weights to compensate for institution-level nonresponse.

Base weights. The selection probability for an institution's selection into the sample, P^*_{hi}, was calculated by dividing the institution's MOS by the product of the total number of faculty members in the institution sampling stratum which included that institution and the reciprocal of the desired sample of institutions for that stratum. The first-stage base weight for institution i in stratum h, $W_{1,hi}$, is the reciprocal of the first-stage selection probability, P^*_{hi}. These initial weights reflect the several steps used to select the institutions. In the first step, a stratified sample was drawn, with extra selections from each stratum. The selections were then sorted into two groups, Pool 1 and Pool 2, so that (i) all certainty selections were put into Pool 1, and (ii) the noncertainty selections within each stratum were systematically randomly allocated to Pool 1 or Pool 2. The Pool 1 institutions were those selected for initial fielding in the survey, and the Pool 2 institutions were extra institutions to compensate for nonresponse among Pool 1 institutions. Thus, although all of Pool 1 institutions were selected for the sample, most of the Pool 2 selections were not selected. Within each stratum, Pool 2 institutions were sorted into random order and then selected as needed for inclusion in the survey.

For institution i, in stratum h, with a desired sample size of n_h, the selection probability is

$$P^*_{hi} = \frac{MOS_{hi}}{\dfrac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_h} MOS_{hi}}{n_h}}$$

For institution i, in stratum h, the first-stage base weight is

$$W_{1.hi} = 1/P^*_{hi},$$

with P^*_{hi} representing the probability that institution i in stratum h was selected for fielding. The selection probability for institution i in pool g and in stratum h was 1 for certainty institutions and $P_{hi}(b_{1h} + a_{2h})/b_h$ for noncertainty institutions, with

a_{gh} = number of noncertainty selections in Pool g, stratum h that were actually fielded
b_{gh} = total number of noncertainty selections in Pool g, stratum h
b_h = the total number of noncertainty selections in either pool ($= b_{1h} + b_{2h}$)
P_{hi} = probability that institution i in stratum h was selected into either Pool 1 or Pool 2.

Note that $a_{1h} = b_{1h}$. The probability that noncertainty institution i in stratum h was selected into Pool 1 and fielded is $P_{hi}b_{1h}/b_h$ (all Pool 1 institutions were fielded); the probability for a certainty institution is 1. The probability that institution i in stratum h was selected into Pool 2 and surveyed is $P_{hi}a_{2h}/b_h$. The probability that institution i in stratum h was selected for fielding is the sum of these two probabilities.

Adjustment for multiplicity. After the sample had been selected and institutions were contacted, it was learned that a few of the institutions in the sample had merged with other institutions on the sampling frame. Since a merged institution would be in the sample if either listing of the institution was selected from the frame, its sampling weight had to be reduced. Let A denote the listing of the institution that was selected and let B denote the other listing. If P^*_A and P^*_B denote the respective selection probabilities, the probability of surveying either institution was approximately $P^*_A + P^*_B - P^*_A \times P^*_B$. (This approximation rests on the assumption of independence of selection, which has a trivial numerical effect.) Thus, the weights for such an institution were modified accordingly. Specifically, the base weight for institution A was changed to

$$W'_{1.A} = W_{1.A} \times W_{1.B} / [W_{1.A} + W_{1.B} - 1]$$

if institution A was identified with institution B, and $W'_{1.A} = W_{1.A}$ otherwise. We will use the notation $W'_{1.hi}$ to denote the weight for institution i in stratum h after modifications of the weights for multiplicity.

Adjustment for nonresponse. Prior to computing the nonresponse adjustment, two indicators were created to flag cooperating and eligible institutions. The first indicator, I_{hi}, was given the value of 1 if institution i in stratum h cooperated in the survey and 0 if the institution did not cooperate. Similarly, the second indicator variable, J_{hi}, was set to 1 if the surveyed institution i in stratum h was found to be eligible and to 0 if it was found to be ineligible. Institutions that turned out to be ineligible as cooperators were classified; thus, it is possible that $I_{hi} = 1$ and $J_{hi} = 0$. Institutions were classified according to Exhibit 3-2, in which $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ denotes a weighted number of institutions in the sample (weighted by $W'_{1.hi}$).

Exhibit 3-2: Classification of institutions by eligibility and cooperation

	Eligible	Not eligible	Total
Respondents	η_{11}	η_{12}	$\eta_{1\cdot}$
Nonrespondents	η_{21}	η_{22}	$\eta_{2\cdot}$
Total	η_{+1}	η_{+2}	η_{++}

The desired response rate for the weighting adjustment is η_{11}/η_{+1}, based on eligible institutions. However, direct estimates are available for only η_{11}, η_{12}, η_{1+}, η_{2+}, and η_{++}. If a surveyed institution was ineligible for the survey, that fact would have been established during the contacting process, i.e., $\eta_{22} = 0$.[11] This implies that η_{+1}can be calculated as $\eta_{+1} = \eta_{++} - \eta_{12}$ and the desired response rate by $\eta_{11}/(\eta_{++} - \eta_{12})$. In calculating nonresponse adjustments, the first-stage response rate can be estimated for stratum h, $R_{1.h}$, using data only from institutions not found to be ineligible as indicated below:

$$R_{1.h} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{b_h} W'_{1.hi} I_{hi} J_{hi}}{\sum_{i=1}^{b_h} W'_{1.hi} J_{hi}}.$$

In adjusting the institution-level weights, the original sampling strata were used to define nonresponse adjustment cells. (The response rates did not vary widely across other subgroups of institutions.)

The first-stage nonresponse-adjusted weight, $W''_{1.hi}$, was then calculated as:

$$W''_{1.hi} = W'_{1.hi} / R_{1.hi}.$$

3.12 Calculation of Faculty Weights

Weights for the faculty sample were computed in four steps. First, the base conditional selection probabilities were calculated; these reflected the selection rates for faculty members given that their institutions were sampled. In this step, the initial selection probabilities also were adjusted to reflect the exclusion of a random subsample of faculty. Then the reciprocals of these selection probabilities were calculated to yield conditional base weights. Second, these faculty base weights were multiplied by the first-stage nonresponse-adjusted weights to yield second-stage sampling weights adjusted for institutional nonresponse. Third, a second-stage nonresponse adjustment factor was applied to these latter weights to compensate for nonresponse by faculty members. Fourth, the nonresponse-adjusted weights were poststratified to the best estimates of total, full-, and part-time faculty by sampling stratum.

---

[11] The contacting process was extensive and served two related goals, gaining cooperation and determining eligibility. The field staff were trained to be able to determine the eligibility of an institution. Since all nonresponding institutions were contacted, the eligibility rate is a known quantity for all institutions, both responding and nonresponding. Of the 974 institutions in the total sample, 12 (1.2 percent) were found to be ineligible. Ineligible institutions included those which had closed or which had merged with other institutions, satellite campuses that were not independent units, and institutions that did not grant any degrees or certificates.

Second-stage weights. Faculty members in the surveyed institutions were selected by stratified random sampling within five strata per institution. The strata were based on classification of faculty as (i) black, non-Hispanic/ Hispanic (ii) full-time female faculty, (iii) faculty in one of the NEH disciplines, (iv) Asian/Pacific Islander faculty, and (v) all other faculty. The classification was unique, so that any faculty member on the institution's roster was assigned to only one stratum. Letting N_f denote the number of faculty on the roster who were assigned to stratum f, and n_f denote the number of faculty in stratum f in the institution who were sampled, the *initial* second-stage raw conditional selection probability weight for faculty member k in stratum f was calculated as n_f / N_f.

Each faculty member in the sample was classified into one of six "waves," denoted by the subscript j, and each faculty member was identified as being a respondent (or "initial respondent") or not by that point in the fielding of the sample. The first wave consisted of faculty who were contacted early on in the survey, and second wave faculty were contacted somewhat later, and the sixth wave faculty were contacted last. Thus, S_{kj} was set to 1 if faculty member k in wave j was an initial respondent and was 0 otherwise. If T_j denotes the number of initial nonrespondents in wave j, then

$$T_j = \sum_{k \in wave\ j} (1 - S_{kj}).$$

As discussed in section 3.9, 2,000 of the selected faculty were deliberately dropped from the sample during fielding of the sample. The exclusions were made randomly but the exclusion probabilities were not constant. Overall, 2,000 initial nonrespondents were dropped after subsampling. Let m_j denote the number of such excluded nonrespondents in wave j. The conditional probability that a faculty member was retained in the sample (i.e., not excluded), given that he or she was in wave j, equaled 1 if the faculty member was an initial respondent in that wave (i.e., if $S_{kj} = 1$), and it equaled $(1 - m_j/T_j)$ if the faculty member was an initial nonrespondent ($S_{kj} = 0$).

Thus, for initial respondents in each wave, the second-stage base weight ($W_{2,fk}$ for faculty member k in faculty-stratum f) was given by

$$W_{2,fk} = N_f / n_f.$$

For initial nonrespondents in wave j, the base weight was

$$W_{2,fjk} = N_f / [n_f(1 - m_j / T_j)].$$

Adjustment for institution-level selection and nonresponse. The second-stage weights were adjusted for institutional sampling and nonresponse by multiplying the raw second-stage faculty weight by the final institution-level weight. Thus, for faculty member k in faculty stratum f in institution i in institution-level stratum h, the adjusted weight ($W'_{2,fkhi}$) is given by

$$W'_{2,fkhi} = W_{2,fk} W''_{1,hi} \text{ or } W_{2,fjk} W''_{1,hi}$$

depending on whether the respondent was classified as an initial respondent or initial nonrespondent.

Adjustment for faculty nonresponse. Response rates for part-time faculty differed significantly from those for full-time faculty. The nonresponse adjustment for faculty weights accounts for this. The following three variables were cross-classified to create the cells for nonresponse adjustment: institution stratum (15 categories), part-time/full-time status (two categories),[12] and race/ethnicity (two categories).[13] In principle, there should not be any missing values on the three classification variables. However, faculty lists for some institutions reported missing values for full-time/part-time status and for race/ethnicity, as illustrated in Exhibit 3-3.

Exhibit 3-3: Profile of faculty sampling lists

Total number of faculty sampling lists	31,354
Race/ethnicity present on sampling lists	22,715
Race/ethnicity missing on sampling lists	8,639
Available from faculty questionnaire	6,235
Not available from faculty questionnaire: Imputed	2,404
Full/part-time status present on sampling lists	27,659
Full/part-time status missing on sampling lists	3,695
Available from faculty questionnaire	2,824
Not available from faculty questionnaire: Imputed	871

Most of the missing data was directly imputed from the faculty questionnaire. The remainder of missing data for part-time/full-time status and for race/ethnicity was imputed using the sequential hot-deck method within the 15 institution strata.

To calculate nonresponse adjustment factors, let $W_{1.ijkl}$ be the base weights for lth faculty with jth part-time/full-time status and kth race/ethnicity background in ith institution stratum. And let corresponding indicator I_{ijkl} be the response indicator, i.e., $I_{ijkl}=1$ if the sampled faculty member responded to the survey and $I_{ijkl}=0$ if the sampled faculty member did not respond to the survey. The response rate, R_{ijk}, for faculty members with jth part-time/full-time status and kth race/ethnicity background in ith institution stratum is

$$R_{ijk}=\frac{\sum_{l} W_{1.ijkl} I_{ijkl}}{\sum_{l} W_{1.ijkl}}$$

with the summation over *eligible* faculty selected within *ijk*th cell for the full-time faculty and with the summation over *all* faculty selected within *ijk*th cell for part-time faculty, where this full-time/part-time status and race/ethnicity is obtained largely from the faculty list. It is assumed that all the ineligible cases for full-time faculty have been identified, and that the same ineligibility rate applies between respondents and nonrespondents among part-time faculty. This means that it is assumed that all nonrespondents coded as full-time are eligible, while nonrespondents coded as part-time are partly eligible and partly ineligible in the same ratio as among respondents coded as part-time.

---

[12] 1=Full-time, 2=Part-time, as determined by faculty list.

[13] 1=White; 2=non-White.

The faculty weight adjusted for the nonresponse, $W_{2,ijkl}$, was

$$W_{2,ijkl} = \frac{W_{1,ijkl}}{R_{ijk}}$$

Within each cell, if there were at least 15 cases and the weighted response rate was not less than two-thirds of the overall weighted response rate, the nonresponse adjustment factor was computed. When a given cell did not meet these criteria, it was collapsed with a neighboring cell. Collapsing on race/ethnicity occurred first, followed by collapsing on part-time/full-time status. Such collapsing is intended to limit the large increase in variability that could be associated with large adjustment factors (i.e., large R^{-1}).

Poststratification to "best estimates." To create the final faculty weights, nonresponse-adjusted faculty weights were poststratified to "best estimates" of the national population of full-time and part-time faculty. Chapter 10 describes the procedures used to derive best estimates. Let $\hat{T}_{ij}$ be the best estimate for the total number of faculty with *j*th part-time/full-time status in *i*th institution stratum. The post-stratified weights, $W_{3,ijkl}$, are

$$W_{3,ijkl} = W_{2,ijkl} \frac{\hat{T}_{ij}}{\sum_{k}\sum_{l} W_{2,ijkl}}$$

with the summation over all respondents within *ij*th cell. These poststratified final faculty weights produce the weighted national population estimates for the NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire dataset.

The poststratification adjustment should reduce sampling variability, and more importantly reduce any reporting biases and bias due to undercoverage of the faculty sampling frame. Poststratification provides a means of weighting the faculty respondents to represent all faculty on the original faculty sampling frame as well as faculty missed on the frame. The method is entirely analogous to the nonresponse adjustment, where faculty respondents are weighted up to represent themselves as well as the faculty nonrespondents. While the nonresponse adjustment is based upon the assumption that the means of respondents and nonrespondents are similar, the poststratification adjustment is based upon the assumption that the means of covered faculty and missed faculty are similar. Neither assumption is perfect, but the resulting estimates are thought to be more accurate than they would be in the absence of the adjustments.

3.13 Calculation of Weights for Institution Questionnaires

The weights for institution questionnaires were calculated in the same manner as the first-stage weights for institutions from which faculty were selected (see section 3.11), the only difference being the definition of "respondent." For calculating the weights for institutions with institution questionnaires, a respondent was defined as any institution from which an acceptable institution questionnaire was received. For most institutions, the response classification was identical under the two criteria. As a result, the weighting cells for the first-stage weights were used without change for the weights for institution questionnaires. Exhibit 3-4 provides summary statistics of the faculty and institution weights.

Exhibit 3-4: Summary statistics for NSOPF-93 faculty and institution weights

Statistic	Faculty	Institution
Mean	40.11	3.66
Variance	1,605.92	16.68
Standard Deviation	40.07	4.09
Minimum	1.28	1.15
Maximum	710.75	27.11
Skewness	4.21	2.47
Kurtosis	33.95	5.8
Sum of Weights (rounded to whole number)	1,033,966	3,188

3.14 Design Effects and Approximate Standard Errors

Statistical estimates calculated using NSOPF-93 survey data are subject to two sources of error: sampling errors and nonsampling errors. Sampling errors occur because the estimates are based on a sample of individuals in the population rather than on the entire population. Sampling errors can be quantified using statistical procedures in which a variance estimate is calculated. NSOPF-93 analytical reports provide each estimate's standard error, which measures the variability of the sample estimator in repeated sampling, using the same sample design and sample size. It indicates the variability of a sample estimator that would be obtained from all possible samples of a given design and size. Standard errors are used as a measure of the precision expected from a particular sample. If all possible samples were surveyed under similar conditions, intervals of 1.96 standard errors below to 1.96 standard errors above a mean or proportion would include the true population parameter in about 95 percent of the samples. In general, for large sample sizes (*n* greater than or equal to 30) and for estimates of the mean or the proportion, the intervals described above provide a 95 percent confidence interval. If sample sizes are too small, or if the parameters being estimated are not means or proportions, then these intervals may not correspond to the 95 percent confidence level.

Sample estimates also are subject to bias from nonsampling errors. It is more difficult to measure the magnitude of these errors. They can arise for a variety of reasons: nonresponse, noncoverage, differences in the respondent's interpretation of the meaning of questions, memory effects, misrecording of responses, incorrect editing, coding, and data entry, time effects, or errors in data processing. For example, noncoverage or incomplete lists (in which institutions did not provide a complete enumeration of eligible faculty) and listing of ineligible faculty necessitated the "best estimates" correction to decrease measurement error in the NSOPF-93 faculty population estimates. (For a more detailed discussion of the noncoverage problem, see Chapter 10.) The NSOPF-93 field test, discussed in Chapter 1, tested the faculty and institution questionnaires (as well as the sample design, data collection, and data processing procedures) to minimize the potential for nonsampling errors.

Because the sample design involved stratification, disproportionate sampling, and clustered (i.e., multi-stage) probability sampling, the calculation of exact standard errors for survey estimates can be difficult. While popular statistical analysis packages such as SPSS or SAS can often accommodate unequal selection probabilities in the calculation of standard errors and other statistics by allowing for the use of weights, they do not calculate standard errors by taking into account complex sample designs. Because of NSOPF-93's complex sample design, standard errors generated by SPSS and SAS will usually underestimate the sampling variability of statistical estimates such as population means, percentages, and more complex statistics such as correlations and regression coefficients. Several procedures are available for calculating precise estimates of sampling errors for complex samples. Procedures such as Taylor series approximation, balanced half-sample replication (BHS), and jackknife repeated replication (JRR) produce similar results.[14] Consequently it is largely a matter of convenience which approach is taken. For BHS, 32 replicate weights are provided on the NSOPF-93 faculty and institution data files. The Data Analysis System (DAS), available on CD-ROM, calculates variances with the Taylor series approximation method.

The institution sampling stratum variable, ISTRATUM, and the primary sampling unit variable, PSU, are provided on the data files to facilitate calculation of standard errors using the Taylor series approximation method.[15] This method was used to calculate standard errors reported in NSOPF-93 analytical reports. Standard errors reported in the NSOPF-93 institution report, *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education* [NCES 97-080] were produced with SUDAAN software using a "without replacement" design to handle the certainty stratum and the large sampling fractions in certain strata. These variance estimates assume a zero variance for the stratum of institutions selected with certainty. (Section 3.15 discusses in greater detail variance estimation for institutions selected with certainty.) In using the Taylor-series approximation method to calculate variances for the faculty report *Instructional Faculty and Staff in Higher Education Institutions: Fall 1987 and Fall 1992,* [NCES 97-470] based on the NSOPF-93 faculty dataset, a "with replacement" design was utilized.

The impact of departures from simple random sampling on the precision of sample estimates is often measured by the design effect. For any statistical estimator (for example, a mean or a proportion), the design effect is the ratio of the estimate of the variance of a statistic derived from consideration of the sample design to that obtained from the formula for simple random samples.

Exhibits 3-5 through 3-7 present standard errors and design effects for the NSOPF-93 faculty and institution data, calculated with SUDAAN's Taylor series approximation method. These standard errors and design effects used weighted data and took into account NSOPF-93's complex sample design. Faculty questionnaire standard errors and design effects, presented in Exhibit 3-5, were calculated using a "with replacement" design. Institution questionnaire standard errors and design effects, presented in Exhibit 3-6, use SUDAAN's "without replacement" design with finite population correction factors. The standard errors and design effects presented in Exhibits 3-5 through 3-7 take into account the features of the sampling design: 1) stratification in the selection of institutions; and, 2) clustering (i.e., the use of institutions as first-stage sampling units).

Exhibits 3-5 and 3-6 present standard errors and design effects ("DEFF") for 30 randomly selected dichotomized items from the faculty and institution questionnaires. In selecting items from each questionnaire, 30 questions were randomly selected, using systematic selection from the beginning of the questionnaire. Response categories for each selected survey question were dichotomized for the purpose of representing the full range of levels which percentages can assume, i.e., the range from one percent (equivalently, 99 percent) to 50 percent.

---

[14] Frankel, M., *Inference from Survey Samples: An Empirical Investigation* (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1971).

[15] Two widely available variance estimation software packages, SUDAAN and CENVAR, use the Taylor series approximation method to calculate variances. For more information on SUDAAN, see Shah, Babubhai V., Beth G. Barnwell and Gayle S. Bieler, *SUDAAN User's Manual Release 6.4* (Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, 1995). For information on CENVAR, see U.S. Bureau of the Census, *CENVAR IMPS Version 3.1* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1995).

The column titled "Questionnaire item" in these exhibits gives a brief description of the dichotomous item. A separate column titled "Question response number" gives the questionnaire numbers of the question and response categories which were used to construct this dichotomous item. For example, the first item in Exhibit 3-5 pertains to the percent of faculty who said they were hired by the institution for which they worked in 1981 or before. Similarly, the second item in Exhibit 3-6 refers to the percentage of institution respondents who selected response categories 0 or 1 in response to subitem A of Question 7 in questionnaire section B, i.e., "B7a:0,1". Thus, 49.35 percent of institution respondents answered that one or no tenured full-time faculty members who left the institution between Fall 1991 and Fall 1992 retired.

Exhibit 3-7 presents *average* design effects ("DEFF") for the faculty sample and questionnaire treated in Exhibit 3-5. Exhibit 3-7 also presents the average of the square roots of DEFFs ("DEFT") for the same sets of dichotomous items. This exhibit presents mean DEFFs and mean DEFTs not only for total respondents but also for 30 subgroups: two genders (male and female), five racial/ethnic groups, and subgroups based on tenure status, faculty rank, employment status, and type and control of institution. Because of small sample sizes within each Carnegie classification stratum in the institution sample, a similar exhibit of mean DEFFs and DEFTs was not produced for the institution sample.

Researchers who do not have access to software for computing estimates of standard errors can use the mean design effects presented in Exhibit 3-7 to approximate the standard errors of statistics based on the NSOPF-93 data. Design-corrected standard errors for a proportion can be approximated from the standard error computed using the formula for the standard error of a proportion based on a simple random sample and the appropriate mean root design effect (DEFT):

$$\mathrm{SE} = \mathrm{DEFT} \times [(p\,(1-p)/n)]^{1/2} \qquad (1)$$

where p is the weighted proportion of respondents giving a particular response, n is the size of the sample, and DEFT is the mean root design effect.

Similarly, the design-corrected standard error of a mean can be approximated from the standard error based on simple random sampling and the appropriate mean DEFT:

$$\mathrm{SE} = \mathrm{DEFT} \times (\mathrm{Var}/n)^{1/2} \qquad (2)$$

where Var is the simple random sample variance, n is the size of the sample, and DEFT is the mean root design effect. Exhibit 3-7 makes clear that the design effects and root design effects vary considerably by subgroup. It is therefore important to use the mean DEFT for the relevant subgroup in calculating approximate standard errors for subgroup statistics.

Standard error estimates may be needed for subgroups that are not tabulated here. One rule of thumb may be useful in such situations: design effects will generally be smaller for groups that are formed by subdividing the subgroups listed in the tables. This is because smaller subgroups will be less affected by clustering than larger subgroups. Estimates for minority respondents, for example, will generally have smaller design effects than the corresponding estimates for all respondents. For this reason, it will usually be conservative to use the subgroup mean DEFT to approximate standard errors for estimates concerning a portion of the subgroup. This rule applies only when the variable used to subdivide a subgroup crosscuts institutions. Gender is one such variable, since most institutions include faculty of both sexes. It will not reduce the average cluster size to form groups that are based on subsets of institutions.

Standard errors may also be needed for other types of estimates than the simple means and proportions that are the basis for the results presented here. A second rule of thumb can be used to estimate approximate standard errors for comparison between subgroups. If the subgroups crosscut institutions, then the design effect for the difference between the subgroup means will be somewhat smaller than the design effect for the individual means. The variance of the difference estimate will be less than the sum of the variances of the two subgroup means from which it is derived:

$$\mathrm{Var}(b\text{-}a) \leq \mathrm{Var}(b) + \mathrm{Var}(a) \qquad (3)$$

in which $\mathrm{Var}(b\text{-}a)$ refers to the variance of the estimated difference between the subgroup means, and $\mathrm{Var}(a)$ and $\mathrm{Var}(b)$ refer to the variances of the two subgroup means. It follows from equation (3) that $\mathrm{Var}(a) + \mathrm{Var}(b)$ can be used in place of $\mathrm{Var}(b\text{-}a)$ with conservative results.

A final rule of thumb is that some complex estimators show smaller design effects than simple estimators.[16] Thus, correlation and regression coefficients tend to have smaller design effects than subgroup comparisons, and subgroup comparisons have smaller design effects than means. This implies that it will be conservative to use the mean root design effects presented here in calculating approximate standard errors for multiple regression coefficients. The procedure for calculating such approximate standard errors is the same as with simpler estimates. First, a standard error is calculated using the formula for data from a simple random sample; then, the simple random sample standard error is multiplied by the appropriate mean root design effect. This rule of thumb may not apply to other complex estimators,[17] and analysts should use caution in applying it to complex estimators other than regression coefficients.

---

[16] Kish, L., and Frankel, M., "Inference from Complex Samples," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* (Methodological), 36 (1974): 2-37.

[17] Skinner, C.J., Holt, D., and Smith, T.F.M., eds., *Analysis of Complex Surveys* (Chichester, England: Wiley, 1989): 70.

Exhibit 3-5: NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire: standard errors and design effects

Questionnaire item	Question response number	Estimate	Design S.E.[a]	DEFT	DEFT	*n*	SRS-S.E.[b]
Year started job at institution	A6:≤81	30.11	0.54	3.58	1.89	25780	0.29
Highest degree received	B16A1:1, 2	48.98	0.93	8.84	2.97	25454	0.31
Other employment besides institution	B17:1	53.51	0.74	5.65	2.38	25780	0.31
Employment sector of other main job held	B18:4-8	66.17	0.76	3.1	1.76	10003	0.43
Primary responsibility in three most recently held jobs	B19B3:1, 2	9.29	0.48	3.24	1.8	12164	0.27
Number of book/article reviews published during career	B20A5: ≥5	8.32	0.32	3.49	1.87	25780	0.17
No. of articles published in non-refereed journals in last 2 years	B20B2: ≥2	9.19	0.34	3.48	1.87	25780	0.18
Number of patents/copyrights won in last 2 years	B20B13:0	96.86	0.17	2.54	1.59	25780	0.11
Number of graduate thesis committees chaired in Fall 1992	C21B4:0	89.48	0.41	4.54	2.13	25780	0.19
Was 1st for-credit course taught in Fall 1992 team taught?	C23A2f:1	11.25	0.45	4.13	2.03	21774	0.22
Avg. number of hours/week taught 2nd for-credit course in Fall 1992	C23B2g: ≥5	18.22	0.66	4.07	2.02	16098	0.33
Level of students taught in 3rd for-credit course in Fall 1992	C23C3:1	54.01	0.88	2.45	1.57	10474	0.56
Primary instructional method used in 4th for-credit course taught in Fall 1992	C23D4:1	54.74	0.86	1.25	1.12	5959	0.77
Taught any for-credit undergraduate courses in Fall 1992?	C24:2	62.86	0.97	10.49	3.24	25780	0.3
Used competency-based grading in undergraduate course	C24Ak:3	37.49	0.55	2.12	1.46	18249	0.38
Engaged in professional research, writing	C28:1	53.02	0.84	7.3	2.7	25780	0.31
Foundation/nonprofit funding for research?	C33B2: ≥2	25.98	1.6	2.09	1.45	1379	1.11

Exhibit 3-5: NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire: standard errors and design effects (cont.)

Questionnaire item	Question response number	Estimate	Design S.E.[a]	DEFF	DEFT	*n*	SRS-S.E.[b]
Total research funds obtained from state/local government	C33D4: ≥5000	80.74	1.78	1.7	1.3	786	1.37
Assessment of institution's research equipment	C34a:3,4	71.34	0.62	2.82	1.68	15113	0.37
Assessment of institution's studio/performance space	C34j:1	10.19	0.48	2.00	1.41	8406	0.34
Adequacy of institution's funding for professional travel	C35C3:1	61.95	0.75	2.41	1.55	12098	0.48
Avg. hours per week spent on unpaid activities	C36b: ≥5	32.36	0.46	2.47	1.57	25780	0.29
Preferred percent of work time for professional growth	C37Bc: ≥50	1.22	0.09	1.64	1.28	25780	0.07
Satisfaction with work load	D40a:2	17.5	0.34	2.06	1.44	25780	0.24
Likelihood of accepting part-time job at non-postsecondary institution in next 3 years	D41c:3	85.9	0.38	3.00	1.73	24731	0.22
Importance of instructional facilities in decision to leave current institution	D43h:3	61.69	0.45	2.24	1.5	25780	0.3
Basic salary in 1992 (dollars)	E47a: 100000+	2.71	0.22	4.77	2.18	25780	0.1
Royalties or commissions received in 1992 (dollars)	E47m: ≥2000	3.07	0.17	2.51	1.58	25780	0.11
Citizenship status	F57:2	5.99	0.25	2.76	1.66	25780	0.15
Have opportunities for junior faculty advancement improved or worsened	F60b:1	29.55	0.55	2.98	1.73	20765	0.32

[a] Standard errors calculated taking into account the sample design.

[b] Standard errors calculated under the assumption of simple random sampling.

Exhibit 3-6: NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire standard errors and design effects

Questionnaire item	Question response number	Estimate	Design S.E.[a]	DEFF	DEFT	*n*	SRS-S.E.[b]
Number of permanent full-time faculty who left in last year	B2e:0	33.57	2.18	1.85	1.36	871	1.60
Number of tenured full time faculty who retired last year	B7a:0,1	49.35	2.44	1.47	1.21	726	2.01
Has institution taken action to lower percentage of full-time faculty in last five years?	B10c:2	91.93	1.19	1.17	1.08	726	1.10
Institution subsidy to state retirement plan for full-time faculty	B12c1:1	20.41	1.77	0.75	0.87	528	2.04
Full-time faculty benefits: wellness program	B13a:2	57.27	2.07	1.53	1.24	871	1.67
Full-time faculty benefits: tuition remission for faculty children	B13g:2	30.94	1.99	1.61	1.27	871	1.57
Institution subsidy for meal plan for full-time faculty	B13j1:1	22.27	6.23	3.22	1.79	114	3.47
Temporary full-time faculty benefits: medical insurance or medical care	B16b:1	85.83	2.32	1.99	1.41	584	1.64
Temporary full-time faculty benefits: life insurance	B16e:1	72.41	2.47	1.37	1.17	584	2.11
Temporary full-time faculty benefits: transportation/parking	B16k:2	35.27	2.56	1.29	1.14	584	2.25
Institution subsidy for retiree medical insurance for temporary full-time faculty	B16n1:1,2	74.14	3.07	0.85	0.92	250	3.33
Peer evaluations used to assess full-time faculty performance	B18g:1	63.75	2.24	1.89	1.37	871	1.63

Exhibit 3-6: NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire standard errors and design effects (cont.)

Questionnaire item	Question response number	Estimate	Design S.E.[a]	DEFF	DEFT	*n*	SRS-S.E.[b]
Total number of permanent full-time faculty in Fall 1991 (last yr.)	C20f: ≥100	6.49	0.99	0.83	0.91	566	1.09
Number of full-time faculty considered for tenure in 1992-93	C24a:0-5	99.07	0.23	0.14	0.37	315	0.61
403B retirement plan available to full-time non-instructional faculty?	C28b:2	51.81	3.06	1.93	1.39	556	2.20
Institution subsidy for wellness program for full-time non-instructional faculty	C29a1:1	31.32	3.11	1.02	1.01	301	3.08
Institution subsidy for disability insurance for full-time non-instructional faculty	C29d1:3	20.41	2.25	1.42	1.19	518	1.89
Full-time non-instructional faculty benefits: meals	C29j:2	80.16	2.73	2.42	1.56	556	1.75
Institution subsidy for paternity leave for full-time non-instructional faculty	C29m1:2	31.26	3.06	1.33	1.15	386	2.65
Temporary full-time non-instructional faculty benefits: life insurance	C32e:2	27.11	3.57	1.47	1.21	307	2.94
Institution subsidy for child care for temporary full-time non-instructional faculty	C32h1:2	26.32	4.48	0.85	0.92	129	4.86
Temporary full-time non-instructional faculty benefits: retiree medical insurance	C32n:1	42.05	3.66	1.25	1.12	307	3.27
Availability of retirement plans for part-time faculty	D34:2	57.46	2.1	1.52	1.23	857	1.70

Exhibit 3-6: NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire standard errors and design effects (cont.)

Questionnaire item	Question response number	Estimate	Design S.E.[a]	DEFF	DEFT	*n*	SRS-S.E.[b]
Availability of 401K or 401B plans for part-time faculty	D35d1: 1,2	24.50	11.26	2.57	1.60	51	7.02
Part-time faculty benefits: tuition remission for children	D37g:1	30.43	3.12	1.91	1.38	493	2.26
Institution subsidy for housing/mortgage for part-time faculty	D37i1:3	53.55	13.49	2.05	1.43	29	9.42
Part-time faculty benefits: other	D37p:2	88.39	2.28	2.09	1.45	493	1.58
Benefit eligibility criteria for part-time staff	D39:1	72.15	2.98	1.83	1.35	493	2.20
Percent of part-time faculty meeting eligibility criteria for receiving benefits	D40c2: 0-20	37.18	4.74	1.46	1.21	202	3.92
Methods of evaluating part-time instructors (open-ended)	D42i:2	96.07	0.54	0.66	0.81	857	0.66

[a] Standard errors calculated taking into account the sample design.

[b] Standard errors calculated under the assumption of simple random sampling.

Exhibit 3-7: Mean design effects (DEFF) and root design effects (DEFT) for NSOPF-93 faculty subgroups

Faculty sample strata	DEFF	DEFT
Total	3.52	1.82
Gender		
Male	2.90	1.66
Female	2.53	1.57
Race/ethnicity		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.44	1.17
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.00	1.40
Black, non-Hispanic	2.33	1.50
Hispanic	2.52	1.56
White, non-Hispanic	3.21	1.74
Tenure status		
Tenured	2.62	1.59
On tenure track, but not tenured	2.23	1.47
Not on tenure track	2.29	1.50
No tenure system for R's faculty status	2.24	1.48
No tenure system at institution	3.34	1.78
Faculty rank		
Not applicable	2.21	1.46
Full professor	3.03	1.69
Associate professor	2.43	1.53
Assistant professor	2.45	1.54
Instructor	2.57	1.57
Lecturer	1.75	1.31
Other ranks	2.93	1.61
Type and control of institution		
Public research	1.80	1.32
Private research	2.39	1.51
Public Ph.D. and medical	2.42	1.53
Private Ph.D. and medical	3.85	1.90
Public comprehensive	2.43	1.53
Private comprehensive	2.74	1.57
Private liberal arts	2.62	1.55
Public two-year	3.05	1.69
Other	2.93	1.61
Employment status		
Part-time	2.57	1.58
Full-time	3.03	1.69

3.15 Calculating Estimates for Institutions Selected with Certainty

All 168 institutions in the certainty stratum were selected into the institution sample. One hundred and fifty-two (152) of them returned faculty sampling lists and 144 of them responded to the institution questionnaire. Thus, aside from a small nonresponse variance, the variability associated with this stratum in the institution questionnaire dataset is essentially zero.

Analysts should take note of two cautions about calculating estimates of sampling variability from the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire dataset. First, if a comparison is to be made between the class of institutions in the certainty stratum and other classes of institutions, then (as an approximation) either the variance of the estimator for the certainty stratum should be set equal to zero, or a without-replacement type variance formula should be used for the certainty stratum with an appropriate finite population correction factor to account for random nonresponse variance. The former recommendation is equivalent to setting the variance of the estimated difference equal to the variance of the estimator for the noncertainty class.

Second, if analysis calls for certainty and noncertainty institutions to be combined, then appropriate standard errors should be calculated. For example, in most tables in NSOPF-93 analytical reports, noncertainty institutions are divided into seven (out of nine) modified Carnegie strata, and institutions selected with certainty are divided into three strata: "Public research," "Private research," and "Public doctoral."[18] The two research strata include *only* certainty institutions, and thus any estimators of variance for these strata should follow the recommendations presented above. Standard errors must be calculated for estimators for the public doctoral stratum, however, because it includes both certainty and noncertainty institutions (i.e. medical schools).

Even in the case of the 14 noncertainty strata, many of the sampling fractions are important. Thus, a without-replacement type variance formula—incorporating appropriate finite population correction factors—should be used for these strata also.

3.16 Using Replicate Weights with the NSOPF-93 Datasets

Both the NSOPF-93 institution and faculty datasets include 32 replicate weights for variance estimation. These weights implement the balanced half-sample (BHS) method of variance estimation.[19] Two widely available software packages, WesVarPC®,[20] and PC CARP,[21] have capabilities to use replicate weights to estimate variances.

Analysts who use either the faculty file or the institution file should be cautious about cross-classifying data so deeply that the resulting estimates are based upon a very small number of observations. Analysts should interpret the accuracy of NSOPF-93 statistics in light of estimated standard errors and in light of the number of observations used in the statistics. Analysts should also be cautious about use of BHS-estimated variances that relate to one stratum or to a group of two or three strata. Such variance estimates may be based upon far fewer than 32 replicates, and thus the variance of the variance estimator may be large.

---

[18] In the institution stratum variable used in most NSOPF-93 analytical reports, the stratum labeled "Public doctoral" is not equivalent to the set of "Public, other Ph.D." institutions which form part of the certainty stratum in the sampling variable, since the "Public doctoral" stratum includes medical institutions.

[19] For a discussion of the balanced half-sample (BHS) method of variance estimation, see Wolter, Kirk M., *Introduction to Variance Estimation* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1985), pp. 110-152.

[20] Westat, Inc., *A User's Guide to WesVarPC®, Version 2.0* (Rockville, Md.: Westat, Inc., 1996).

[21] Fuller, Wayne C., *et al., PC CARP IV* (Ames, Iowa: Statistical Laboratory, Iowa State University, 1986).

3.16.1 Faculty File Replicate Weights

To achieve NCES standards, $k = 32$ half-sample replicates were employed in both the restricted-use faculty data file and the public-use faculty data file. The 15 sampling strata were subdivided to form 31 pseudo-strata. Let w_j denote the full-sample weight for the jth faculty respondent, and let $w_{j\alpha}$ denote the weight corresponding to the α-th half-sample for the same respondent. Using $k = 32$ half-sample replicates, 33 (or 1 + 32) sets of weights were created. Nonresponse weighting adjustments and poststratification were performed within each half-sample replicate.

Define the real-valued function $G(\cdot)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} G(w) &= +1, & \quad & \text{if } w > 0, \\ &= -1, & & \text{if } w \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and define $\mathbf{G}_j = (G(w_{j1}), G(w_{j2}), \ldots, G(w_{jk}))$.

The 32 replicate weights provided for variance estimation on the NSOPF-93 faculty data file did not incorporate finite population correction factors. The finite population correction factor (fpc) is omitted, because the faculty population being much larger than the NSOPF-93 sample, the sampling fraction (i.e, the ratio of the sample to the total population) tends to zero and the fpc approaches 1.

3.16.2 Institution File Replicate Weights

Institution dataset replicate weights incorporate finite population correction factors. This is important because several of the institution sampling strata sampled large proportions of institutions listed on the frame. As the number of sampled units in each strata approaches the finite number of possible units that could be sampled in that strata, the standard errors for estimates incorporating these units correspondingly decrease. Therefore, to account fully for the proportion of the frame of institutions in each sampling strata, finite population correction factors (fpc) have been incorporated into the replicate weights. For the purposes of these calculations, the approximate finite population correction factor is:

$$fpc = 1 - \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \frac{1}{w_i}\right]$$

where n is the number of responding institutions in each stratum and w_i is the final institutional weight adjusted for nonresponse. Finite population correction factors for each stratum are reported in Exhibit 3-8.

Replicate weights for the NSOPF-93 institution dataset proceeded from three assumptions. First, random nonresponse was assumed in each stratum. For purposes of variance estimation, the 144 institutions in the certainty stratum were treated as a random sample from a population of 168 institutions. Therefore, the replicate weights calculate a variance for the certainty stratum despite the fact that all certainty institutions were selected into the sample with a probability of one.

Second, all replicate weights incorporate finite population correction factors for each stratum reported in Exhibit 3-8. This approach reflects the "near-certainty" (144 out of 168 institutions) status of the certainty stratum in the NSOPF-93 institution survey. It also includes the important fpc in stratum 1 ("Private, Other Ph.D.") and other noncertainty strata. Standard errors calculated using these replicate weights are smaller than standard errors calculated by other means, such as Taylor series standard errors presented in NCES's report, *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education* [NCES 97-080].

To incorporate finite population corrections in variance calculations, a half-sample estimator was used:

$$\hat{Y}^{*}_{\alpha} = \sum U_{i\alpha} Y_i \qquad (\alpha = 1, \ldots k) ,$$

where the U-weights are defined by

$$U_{i\alpha} = W_i + \sqrt{\lambda_i}\,(W_{i\alpha} - W_i) ,$$

λ_i is the approximate finite population correction factor for the stratum in which institution i was sampled, and the summation is over all respondents in the full sample. The U-weight can be rewritten as

$$U_{i\alpha} = W_i (1 - \sqrt{\lambda_i}), \text{ for institutions not in the } \alpha\text{-th half sample}$$

$$= W_i (1 + \sqrt{\lambda_i}), \text{ for institutions in the } \alpha\text{-th half sample.}$$

Thus, the final replicate weights, i.e., the U-weights, are larger than the full-sample weights for institutions in the half sample and smaller for institutions not in the half sample.

The standard BHS (balanced half-sample) formula for variance calculations applies here, namely

$$v(\hat{Y}) = \frac{1}{k} \sum (\hat{Y}^{*}_{\alpha} - \hat{Y})^2 ,$$

and $\hat{Y}$ is equal to the mean of the $\hat{Y}^{*}_{\alpha}$ across the k half samples. For NSOPF, $k = 32$ for both the institution and the faculty files.

Third, to produce the NCES-required 32 replicate weights, institutions in each pseudo-stratum were separated into two random groups and specified 32 balanced half samples. Replicate weights for each half sample and a set of weights for the full sample were then calculated. Nonresponse weighting was performed independently within each half-sample.

Exhibit 3-8: Finite population correction factors (fpc) for each institution stratum

Institution stratum	Eligible institutions	Institutions responding	Finite population correction factor
Private other Ph.D.	46	39	.1552
Public comprehensive	159	144	.5273
Private comprehensive	82	71	.6422
Public liberal arts	3	2	.9505
Private liberal arts	68	66	.8334
Public medical	25	20	.3103
Private medical	10	9	.5563
Private religious	18	18	.9284
Public two-year	316	298	.5591
Private two-year	10	10	.8877
Public other	7	7	.6864
Private other	24	19	.7913
Public unknown	19	18	.5987
Private unknown	7	7	.8510
Research/public other Ph.D.	168	144	.1429

4. Institutional Recruitment: Procedures and Results

NSOPF-93 differed in a number of significant ways from NSOPF-88. This chapter reviews procedures used for recruiting sampled institutions and collecting faculty lists and related information used for sampling and data collection. Sampling procedures were discussed in Chapter 3. Key changes to the sample frame are outlined below.

- Institution sample size was increased, from 480 in 1988, to a final sample of 974 institutions in 1993. The larger sample allowed for more detailed comparisons both at the faculty and institutional levels. The faculty sample was also augmented to provide data about faculty in key disciplines.

- The criteria for defining faculty were broadened to include non-instructional faculty. Institutions were given a complete set of instructions for preparing the list, including detailed criteria for determining who should be included and excluded from the list. (See Appendix K for list preparation instructions sent to institutions.)

- Representation of certain subgroups of faculty in the sample (full-time females; faculty in NEH-specified disciplines; black, non-Hispanics; Asian/Pacific Islanders; and Hispanics) was increased by oversampling. This required institutions to provide race and gender information not requested in 1988.

- Due to institutional downsizing and increased research demands on institutions, participation in NSOPF and other large-scale surveys was problematic for some institutions (see section 4.3). Institutions are taking longer to comply with research requests, and are far more likely to refuse participation than in years past. Hence, the initial sample of 789 was supplemented by a pool of 185 institutions that were selected to replace non-participating institutions, and to augment the sample by ensuring adequate representation of institutions across strata. At the same time, extensive follow-up and refusal conversion campaigns were conducted with the original sample, as well as with the supplemental sample.

Based on the results of the 1992 field test, the following procedures were implemented in the full-scale study:

- The 1992 field test results clearly demonstrated that institutions that provided the home addresses of faculty had a higher completion rate than those that did not. A majority of institutions were willing to release these data when given assurance that the data would remain confidential. Therefore, institutions were asked to provide home addresses, if possible, while recognizing that some institutions have institutional policies prohibiting the release of this information. Home addresses were used to mail questionnaires and to follow-up with nonrespondents to the faculty survey.

- Institutional Coordinators—the institution staff who agreed to provide the sample lists and work with NORC to implement the survey—were enlisted to prompt nonresponding faculty for the return of their questionnaires. The role of coordinators was crucial given the necessity of extending the field period into the summer of 1993, particularly since many institutions were unable to provide home telephone numbers. The names of sampled faculty were released only to those coordinators who signed the NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure and had it notarized. Under penalty of fines and imprisonment, the affidavit affirms that the signatory will maintain the confidentiality of any information released which identifies individual respondents. Again, the field test demonstrated that two-thirds of the Institutional Coordinators were willing to sign the affidavit, enabling them to prompt faculty.

- To facilitate processing and quality control of the lists, both hardcopy and machine-readable (tape or floppy diskette) versions of the list were requested. To standardize list formats as much as possible, the institution was given detailed specifications for producing machine-readable faculty lists.

- Employee ID numbers were requested from the institution to facilitate quality control of the lists (e.g., checking for duplicate faculty entries) and locating efforts. Again, institutions with provisions against the release of such data were assured they could omit it.

- Other forms and informational materials were provided to assist institutions in preparing lists in a workable, easy-to-read format. These included instructions for formatting the machine-readable versions of the lists, and forms to document the format of the lists and to provide the names, titles, and telephone numbers of individuals involved in preparing the lists. The number of documents in the packet was reduced from eight in the field test, to six in the full-scale study to streamline the process of compliance for the institution.

- Supplementary information was requested in order to help the list processing staff interpret the lists and, if necessary, institution staff were recontacted for clarification of discrepancies. Course catalogs and faculty directories were also requested. The course catalog was requested separately, from the Director of Admissions, to minimize burden to the Institutional Coordinator.

4.1 OMB Clearance and Mail Procedures

The U.S. Department of Education Information Management Compliance Division/Office of Management and Budget (OMB) list collection clearance package for the full scale study was submitted to OMB on September 4, 1992, with a request for expedited review. On September 14, 1992, an amendment to the list collection OMB package was submitted, providing an analysis of the discrepancies in field test faculty counts. A second amendment described the sampling requirements for the study and the NEH and NSF sample augmentation. OMB clearance of the list collection process was given on October 5, 1992.

The initial mailing to sampled institutions was conducted on October 7, 1992. The mailing was directed to the institution's Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). In this first mailing, the CAO was asked to designate two individuals: an Institutional Coordinator to act as a liaison to the project and to assume responsibility for preparing the faculty list; and an institution respondent, who would be responsible for completing the institution questionnaire. Copies of all institutional contacting materials appear in Appendix K.

The initial mailing contained the following materials:

> **Cover letter.** The cover letter was printed on NCES letterhead and signed by Emerson J. Elliott, then Commissioner of NCES. It explained the purpose of the study, detailed NCES' confidentiality laws and protections, requested the CAO's participation, and provided an estimate of institutional burden. It asked the CAO to return the enclosed confirmation form within five days. It also encouraged the CAO to call the Project Director at a toll-free number with any questions or concerns about the study.

Confirmation form. The three-ply confirmation form asked the CAO to provide the name, title, institutional address, and telephone number of the administrative officials designated as the Institutional Coordinator and as the institution respondent. The form noted that the same person could be designated to perform both roles. Fewer than one-half (44.2 percent) of the Institutional Coordinators in the full-scale study were also named as institution respondents. The Institutional Coordinator was often an academic officer, provost, dean, institutional researcher, personnel manager, or budget officer.

NSOPF-93 informational brochure. The brochure explained the purpose and content of the study and listed key findings from the 1988 study.

Institution folder. This was to be forwarded by the CAO to the individual designated as the Institutional Coordinator. It contained a cover letter to the Institutional Coordinator, similar in content to the letter directed to the CAO (the major difference was that the letter presumed that the CAO had agreed to participate in the study). The folder also contained instructions for preparing the faculty list. These included concise definitions of personnel to be included in and excluded from the lists. Unlike the 1988 study, which required institutions to screen out faculty with no instructional responsibilities, NSOPF-93 requested a list of *all* faculty and other instructional personnel for the academic term including October 15, 1992. The following information was requested for each faculty member on the list: full name, department/program (or equivalent), teaching discipline, campus mailing address and telephone number, employment status (full- or part-time), and demographic and stratification variables (race/ethnicity, gender). To facilitate contacting and locating activities, home addresses, telephone numbers, and employee IDs were also requested, in addition to an up-to-date faculty directory. A deadline of October 30, 1992 was given for return of the faculty list.

The packet to the Institutional Coordinator also included a checklist to be used by the CAO or Institutional Coordinator to ensure that all of the information, documents, and forms requested were included in the return envelope. Finally, the folder contained two prepaid business reply envelopes for the return of the confirmation form, faculty list, and supplementary materials, and an NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure, which the Institutional Coordinator was instructed to sign and have notarized, affirming that he or she would not divulge the names and identifying information of faculty respondents released to him or her.

The contractor's fax number was provided on the cover letter and all other materials directed to the CAO and coordinator in order to allow institutions to expedite the return of certain materials. Because fax legibility varies, institutions who faxed materials were also encouraged to mail the original hardcopy.

A toll-free NSOPF-93 telephone number was prominently displayed on all forms and informational materials to ensure that institution staff had timely access to project staff to answer questions and resolve problems encountered in preparing the lists. Incoming calls were handled by the project's Task Coordinator, and forwarded to the Project Director when necessary. During the list collection process, 679 calls were received. Questions were asked about the instructions and problems encountered in preparing the lists, including staff shortages, scheduling problems, and difficulties in providing all the requested faculty information.

4.1.1 Initial Mailout and Remailings

All 789 initial recruitment packets were sent via first-class mail on October 7, 1992. None of the list collection packages were returned as undeliverable; however, 465 of the 974 institutions (48 percent) in the total sample requested a remail of the initial packet of CAO materials. In some instances, remails were requested because of a change in CAO or a minor address correction; for the most part, however, the remails were necessary because the mail intended for the CAO was frequently routed to other institution staff and, therefore, never received by the CAO. To minimize further delays, all remails were sent by two-day priority mail, and directed whenever possible to the Institutional Coordinator (if identified at the time of the remail request) or to the attention of a gatekeeper or other institutional contact.

Concurrently with the mailouts to the CAO, postcards requesting course catalogs were mailed to the Office of Admissions at each institution. In a small number of instances, institutions requested payment for mailing a course catalog. Whenever it was requested, a payment (generally less than $5) was mailed to these institutions. Information on the number of institutions submitting catalogs is found in section 4.4.

4.1.2 Mail Follow-up Procedures

About two weeks after the initial mail-out, a follow-up postcard was sent to all CAOs, thanking them for their cooperation if they had already returned the Confirmation Form, or if they had not returned the form, urging them to fax or mail the form by the deadline. Once again, they were encouraged to call the NSOPF-93 toll-free number with any questions or concerns.

On January 4, 1993, a follow-up packet was sent via two-day priority mail to the CAOs of approximately 250 nonresponding institutions, containing a letter signed by the Project Director reiterating the importance of the study, and an additional Confirmation Form. It asked once again that the CAO return the Confirmation Form, and call the Project Director at the toll-free number with any questions or concerns.

4.1.3 Mailouts to Supplemental Sample

Twenty-six institutions were finalized as refusals and replaced in the sample prior to March 1, 1993. An initial mailout to seven replacement institutions was done on December 1, 1992 and 19 replacement institutions were mailed packets on January 22, 1993. On March 9, 1993, 159 additional institutions were selected to ensure an adequate sample of institutions across strata, given an anticipated non-participation rate of up to 20 percent. An initial mailing to these institutions was conducted on March 10, 1993. All mailouts to supplemental institutions were sent by two-day priority mail. Telephone follow-up for supplemental institutions took place one week after the initial mailing to speed response time.

4.2 Telephone Follow-up Procedures

Telephone follow-up was coordinated with mail follow-up to minimize unnecessary calls to the CAOs and coordinators. The starting date for telephone follow-up was November 9, 1992, approximately one week after the follow-up postcards to the CAO were mailed. Full-scale telephone follow-up continued through June 1, 1993, at which time the follow-up effort focused on institutions in under-represented strata. Telephone follow-up efforts concluded on June 25, 1993.

4.2.1 Selection and Training of Prompters

Prompters were selected for the CAO prompting effort on the basis of their telephone skills and ability to work with a professional population. A training manual was developed by project staff that contained an overview of the project, and scripts for communicating with CAOs, coordinators, gatekeepers, and other institutional staff. A five-hour training was conducted on November 9, 1992.

4.2.2 Initial Telephone Contact and Follow-up

Telephone prompting of approximately 635 institutions commenced on November 8, 1992, two weeks after the prompting postcard had been mailed. The prompting effort concentrated on nonresponding institutions as well as those who had agreed to participate but for whom a faculty list had not been received. The general purpose of this first telephone contact was to confirm receipt of the recruitment and list collection packet and to urge the institution's CAO to comply promptly with NCES' request. Prompters were trained to do the following:

- Confirm receipt of the recruitment packet
- Introduce the CAO to NSOPF-93 and to the contractor's role
- Answer any questions about NSOPF-93, the confidentiality provisions, and related questions about the study
- Obtain institutional cooperation and request the names of the Institutional Coordinator and institution respondent for the institution questionnaire
- Avert potential refusals
- Establish an expected date for the return of the Confirmation Form or complete the form over the telephone
- Identify any institutional restrictions or problems that could hinder timely compliance with the request for faculty lists
- Remind institutional staff to follow the instructions for compiling the faculty lists and reviewing the checklist in completing the return envelope
- Request the supplementary information (e.g., institution catalog or bulletin, staff directory)
- Prompt the Institutional Coordinator for completion of the list of faculty (i.e., if the packet had been forwarded to him or her by the CAO)

If an institution had not yet received the recruitment packet, the prompter noted any necessary address corrections and submitted a request for remailing. Requests for remails were usually processed on the same day they were received.

4.2.3 Additional Telephone Follow-up for Nonresponse

Follow-up of nonresponding institutions was resumed once the expected date for receipt of the institution's materials had passed. During this call, the telephone prompter once again prompted for the return of materials (or offered to collect the Institutional Coordinator and institution respondent names over the telephone), attempted to establish an anticipated date for receipt of the materials, and answered questions. Prompters were trained to identify and avert "hidden" refusals (i.e., CAOs who verbally agreed to comply with the request, but who in fact had no intention of doing so) and to document explicit refusals for conversion efforts.

4.2.4 Refusals and Problem Cases

Initial refusals were reviewed by the Task Coordinator, who called refusing institutions, forwarded them to another supervisor, prompter, or senior staff, or in some instances, to the NCES Project Officer. The most often cited reasons for refusing to participate include multiple survey requests, fiscal constraints, and decreases in staff. The overall conversion rate, if all nonresponding institutions are considered as final refusals, was 42 percent; 103 refusals were successfully converted for an overall participation rate of 85 percent.

When necessary, special arrangements were made with individual institutions to enlist their participation. For example, nine institutions agreed to participate only if the institution released faculty information by an identifying number only, rather than releasing the names of sampled faculty. In these instances, the institution was responsible for mailing questionnaires and conducting follow-up with faculty.

4.2.5 Telephone Follow-up of List Discrepancies/Retrieval

Upon receipt, each list of faculty was reviewed for completeness and adequacy. Although almost 70 percent of the faculty lists were submitted in electronic form (see Exhibit 4-3), intensive effort was still required to correct problems in the electronic lists before they could be processed and sampled. The most prevalent problems were lists that could not be read or were incorrectly formatted. Other serious obstacles to sampling were lists that were missing key sampling data, appeared with incorrect information, or contained faculty names more than once. Programming staff were needed to create utilities to deal with the most frequently occurring problems, and to assist in reading, evaluating, and de-duplicating machine-readable lists. If sampling or address information was missing from the lists, sampling staff consulted the course catalog, if available, or any other material sent by the institution to attempt to retrieve the information before calling the institution. However, approximately 10 percent of the institutions had to be recontacted to resolve errors in their faculty lists.

Once the faculty lists were processed, and prior to sampling, they were reviewed to compare the faculty totals from the list supplied by the institution with numbers of faculty from IPEDS data. The lists were initially subjected to a rigorous review; institutions whose list counts were discrepant by more than five percent were called and an attempt was made to reconcile the numbers. However, after 71 institutions were contacted, only 15 percent of these calls were effective in reducing the difference between institution and IPEDS counts. Even then, discrepancies could not be resolved altogether. Due to the ineffectiveness of these calls, and the increase in list processing time needed to wait for institution personnel to resolve these problems, further review was made more lenient. List counts were compared with IPEDS numbers and only very gross and obvious errors were resolved, such as full-time and part-time staff being lumped together as full-time, part-time staff being omitted completely, or full-time and part-time counts being reversed. Sampling staff forwarded systematic discrepancies clearly requiring explanation or correction to telephone staff. Two prompters were trained expressly to handle recontacting institution staff to retrieve missing information and resolve list discrepancies.

4.3 Revised Data Collection Plan

An overall institutional participation rate of 85 percent for list collection was achieved for NSOPF-93. The overall participation rate dropped from 89 percent in the NSOPF-93 field test (and 94 percent in the 1988 NSOPF study). The recruitment effort required almost 34 weeks to complete—almost 6 weeks longer than in the field test. The longer field period can be partly accounted for by the interruption of winter break—no follow-up was conducted for two weeks between December 23, 1992 and January 7, 1993. More significant, however, was the continuation of a trend that was evident in the field test results: compared to 1988, institutions were simply taking longer to prepare faculty lists, and were initially more resistant to participating in large-scale research projects. Prominent among the factors causing this were:

> **Survey saturation.** A wide array of studies compete for the attention of already overburdened institution staff. (This is particularly true of large institutions, which have a higher probability of being selected into national samples.) Some institution personnel complained that they were being asked to participate in "too many surveys." Others required assurance that NSOPF-93 did not duplicate other studies, and did not burden faculty unnecessarily.
>
> **Fiscal constraints.** NSOPF-93 went into the field at a time when many institutions were experiencing severe financial constraints and downsizing. As a result, a large proportion of the institutional representatives complained that, because of downsizing or other fiscal constraints, there were no staff available to process the NSOPF request on time. They typically reported that they were already overburdened with their own work and that external requests would not receive priority.
>
> **Uncertain faculty/administration relations.** As a result of the fiscal constraints cited above, some institutions had asked faculty to perform more work—sometimes at less pay. Many of these institutions had expressed concern that requesting faculty participation in a study at a time when many faculty were overworked would strain relations between faculty and administration. Ameliorating this concern, particularly at larger institutions, was the fact that NSOPF-93 only sampled an average of 41.5 faculty at each institution.
>
> **Difficulties in compiling lists of part-time faculty.** Despite increasing reliance on part-time faculty at many institutions, readily accessible files of part-time and temporary faculty and instructional staff do not exist at many institutions. At some institutions, these faculty are listed only in personnel files where they are not easily distinguishable from other kinds of institutional staff. Many institutions required additional time to compile this data; others were simply unwilling or unable to commit staff time and resources to this effort.
>
> **Additional information requested.** As indicated earlier, NSOPF-93 requested more detailed information about each faculty member, including home telephone number and address, and employee IDs along with a machine-readable version of the faculty list. This information proved vital to the success of the faculty component of the study. For institutions unable to provide such information easily, however, these requests often slowed response time for providing a faculty list. In addition, requests for identifying information, such as home addresses and employee IDs, sometimes had to be cleared through legal departments, or occasionally, voted on by a faculty senate. These institutions were concerned not merely about applicable federal law, but also about a growing number of state and local regulations, as well as the individual institution's own policies and agreements with faculty. Institutions were assured that lists would be accepted without data items whose release was prohibited by institutional policy; however, the decision-making process at each institution about whether to include such items sometimes considerably delayed receipt of the list.

To adjust for the slow rate of participation, a total supplemental sample of 185 institutions was drawn to replace and supplement institutions whose characteristics were comparable to those of non-participating institutions.

Telephone staff continued follow-up and refusal conversion activities with institutions in the original sample, while, at the same time, recruiting institutions in the supplemental sample with the goal of obtaining a representative sample across all strata. The progress of list collection efforts across strata was monitored on a weekly basis. Based on this review of participating institutions' data collection, staff were able to focus their efforts on under-represented strata. On April 6, 1993, a revised data collection plan was submitted to NCES, which included the addition of the supplemental sample, and which extended the deadline for participation to June 11, 1993. The deadline was later extended to June 25, 1993 to allow additional time to recruit "certainty" institutions.

4.4 Results of Institution Recruitment

As shown in Exhibit 4-1, faculty lists were collected from 817 institutions, an overall participation rate of 85 percent.[22] However, the data collection period was significantly longer than in the 1992 field test and the 1988 study. Exhibit 4-2 provides faculty list collection rates by type of institution.

Exhibit 4-1: Institutional participation rates for NSOPF cycles

NSOPF cycle	Institutional sample	Number participating	Participation rate (percent)	Length of effort
1987 field test	103	94	91	9 weeks[a]
1988 main study	480	449	94	24 weeks
1992 field test				
Core	54	50	93	28 weeks
Revised core	54	53	98	16 weeks
Augmentation	82	71	87	28 weeks
Combined	136	121	89	28 weeks
1993 main study				
Initial eligible sample	780	663	85	34 weeks
Supplemental eligible sample	182	154	85	16-24 weeks[b]
Combined eligible sample[c]	962	817	85	34 weeks

[a] Does not include time expended by NCES staff in recruiting institutions before this task was transferred to the previous contractor.

[b] Range includes institutions drawn on a flow basis.

[c] The number of eligible institutions in Pool 1 (the initial sample), plus the number of eligible institutions selected from Pool 2. Twelve institutions (nine in the initial sample and three in the supplemental sample) were deemed ineligible for the NSOPF-93 main study.

---

[22] Of the 974 institutions in the total sample, 12 were found to be ineligible during the list collection process, reducing the eligible sample to 962.

Exhibit 4-2: NSOPF-93 institution participation rates by type of institution

Institution type	CONTROL					
	Public		Private		Total	
	Total	Participating (percent)	Total	Participating (percent)	Total	Participating (percent)
Research	71	66 (93.0)	33	30 (90.9)	104	96 (92.3)
Other Ph.D. granting	63	56 (88.9)	46	40 (87.0)	109	96 (88.1)
Comprehensive	159	141 (88.7)	82	67 (81.7)	241	208 (86.3)
Liberal Arts	3	3 (100)	68	57 (83.8)	71	60 (84.5)
Medical	25	21 (84.0)	10	10 (100.0)	35	31 (88.6)
Religious	0	0	18	14 (77.8)	18	14 (77.8)
Two-year	317	258 (81.4)	10	8 (80.0)	327	266 (81.3)
Other	7	6 (85.7)	24	18 (75.0)	31	24 (77.4)
Unknown	19	17 (89.5)	7	5 (71.4)	26	22 (84.6)
Total	**664**	**568 (85.5)**	**298**	**249 (83.6)**	**962**	**817 (84.9)**

Although emphasis was placed on collecting faculty lists from institutions, Exhibit 4-3 provides information on the collection of other requested materials, such as course catalogs and faculty directories. Of the 817 institutions participating in NSOPF-93, 83 percent also submitted a confirmation form. While 75 percent of these institutions provided a course catalog as requested, only 33 percent sent a faculty directory. Exhibit 4-3 also shows the types of faculty lists provided. The majority (67 percent) of the lists were in some type of electronic format.

Exhibit 4-3: Items provided by participating institutions

Item	Number of participating institutions providing item	Percent of 817 participating institutions
Confirmation forms	679	83.1
Signed affidavits	549	67.2
Course catalog	611	74.8
Staff directory	273	33.4
Faculty lists provided as:		
Hardcopy	263	32.2
Diskette	31	3.8
Tape	8	1.0
Combination hardcopy & electronic	510	62.4
Other	5	0.6

Exhibit 4-4 examines the content of the faculty lists provided. The list preparation instructions (see Appendix K) asked the institution to supply several types of data concerning their faculty: sampling information, such as full-or part-time status, discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity; and locating information, such as campus address, home address, and employee ID.

Exhibit 4-4: NSOPF-93 faculty list content

Data item	Number of participating institutions providing data	Percent of 817 participating institutions
Sampling information:		
Gender	731	89.5
Race/ethnicity	608	74.4
Discipline	717	87.8
Full/part-time status	718	87.8
Locating information:		
Home address	512	62.7
Campus address	734	89.8
Employee ID	437	53.5

5. Data Collection Procedures and Implementation

5.1 Overview

Institutions were recruited for NSOPF-93 from an initial sample of 974 postsecondary institutions. (See Chapter 3 for a discussion of sample selection and eligibility. See Chapter 4 for a discussion of the recruitment process and results.) Of these 974 institutions, 962 were eligible and 817 agreed to participate in the study by supplying a list of their faculty. The NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire collected data from a sample of full- and part-time faculty, both instructional and non-instructional, and other staff with instructional duties at participating institutions. The final sample of faculty was 31,354 (the original sample of 33,354 less the subsample of 2,000) drawn from lists supplied by the 817 participating institutions. The NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire collected data from eligible institutions. The institution sample consisted of the 817 institutions who supplied faculty lists and 145 who did not provide lists. Exhibit 5-1 contains the final schedule for all three NSOPF-93 study components; list collection, faculty questionnaires and institution questionnaires.

A supplemental memorandum describing changes to the faculty questionnaire was submitted to OMB on December 18, 1992 and OMB approval was received on January 7, 1993. A multi-modal data collection design was approved. This involved a mailed, self-administered questionnaire, followed by mail and telephone prompting, and supplemented by computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) for nonresponding faculty. The self-administered faculty questionnaire took about 45 minutes on average to complete. A commercial software package called AutoQuest was used to program the CATI version, which involved minor wording and format changes to the self-administered instrument in order to facilitate interviewing by telephone. The CATI version also took about 45 minutes to complete.

A supplemental memorandum describing changes to the institution questionnaire, along with respondent cover letters, was submitted to OMB on June 28, 1993 with a request for expedited approval. OMB approval was received on July 30, 1993. Revisions to the institution questionnaire were finalized in consultation with NCES at the request of OMB. The NSOPF institution questionnaire was mailed to institutional representatives at all 962 eligible institutions, including those that did not supply a list of faculty for the study. Data were collected principally by self-administered questionnaires, although a small number of cases were completed with interviewer assistance.

The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) of each institution named the Institutional Coordinator as institution respondent for the institution questionnaire at 44.2 percent of the sampled institutions. The number of institution staff required to complete the self-administered institution questionnaire varied from a low of one to a high of five, with an average of slightly fewer than two respondents (1.78) per institution. Over one-half (460) of the institutions had a single representative complete the questionnaire; over one-quarter (229) were completed by two respondents; 116 by three respondents; 47 by four respondents; and 20 by five respondents.

For the faculty and institution questionnaires, the response rate is defined as the ratio of the number of completed questionnaires to the number of sample units minus the number of ineligible units. For faculty, the response rate is calculated as 25,780/(31,354 - 1,590 ineligibles) = 86.6 percent (84.4 percent, weighted). The response rate for the institution questionnaire is: 872/(974 - 12 ineligibles) = 90.6 percent (93.5 percent, weighted). The overall faculty response rate (institution list participation multiplied by faculty questionnaire response rate) was 73.5 percent, and 70.4 percent, weighted.

Exhibit 5-1: Chronology of NSOPF-93 data collection

YEAR	Institution List Collection	Faculty Questionnaire	Institution Questionnaire
1992	*October:* Recruitment packets mailed to 789 institutions *November:* Telephone follow-up begins		
1993	*January:* Follow-up packets mailed *March:* Recruitment packets mailed to supplemental sample of 185 *April:* Revised data collection plan submitted to NCES *June:* Institution list collection completed	*January:* Wave 1 mailing *February:* Wave 2 mailing *March:* Wave 3 mailing *April:* Wave 4 mailing *April-December:* Telephone prompting of faculty *May-December:* Follow-up conducted by Institutional Coordinator *July:* Waves 5 and 6 mailings *November-December:* Faculty refusal conversion, use of abbreviated questionnaire *November-December:* Follow-up with specific faculty subgroups; faculty questionnaire data retrieval	*September:* Institution questionnaire mailing *October:* Second institution questionnaire mailing; Institution questionnaire data retrieval begins *November:* Telephone prompting begins for non-responding institutions
1994		*January:* Faculty questionnaire data retrieval completed	*February:* Third institution questionnaire mailing *February-March:* Interviewer-assisted data collection *May:* Institution questionnaire data collection and retrieval completed

5.2 Faculty Survey

Faculty data were collected from January to December, 1993 with a two-month hiatus in July and August. At that time data collection was temporarily suspended because most faculty were on summer break. Because of the difficulty in reaching faculty during the summer months, no telephone follow-up was performed during these two months. Faculty questionnaires were mailed in waves as faculty lists were received and processed. Mailings were sent to the home address of the respondent whenever it was provided by the institution.

5.2.1 Faculty Mail and Telephone Follow-up

Mail follow-up included reminder postcards, periodic questionnaire remails, and follow-up targeted to specific populations, including research faculty, part-time faculty, faculty who initially refused to participate, and faculty who had specific concerns (such as confidentiality). All initial mailings and scheduled follow-up mailings were sent by third class bulk mail; first class and two-day priority mail were used for targeted follow-up mailings to ensure that mail would be promptly forwarded to faculty. Appendix L includes copies of initial and follow-up letters sent to faculty sample members.

The letter which accompanied all faculty mailings included a toll-free telephone number for faculty to call to ask questions about the survey. Staff were available to monitor this number during normal business hours and were able to address any concerns or questions that faculty had. Any messages left after business hours were promptly answered the next day. Approximately 4 percent of the faculty sample called the toll-free number.

Initial telephone calls to faculty asked for prompt return of the self-administered questionnaire by mail. After the second prompting call, interviewers were trained to conduct a telephone interview. Exhibit 5-2 displays the schedule for both the mail and telephone follow-up efforts. Note that only percentages of faculty in each mailout are displayed, as the initial and subsequent mailings were sent to the entire faculty sample of 33,354. (Subsampling of the faculty sample occurred after questionnaires had been mailed.) The data provided are helpful in determining the approximate proportion of faculty needing second and third mailings of the faculty questionnaire.

Exhibit 5-2: NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire mail and telephone schedule (dates mailed and percent of original sample targeted)

Mail wave	Initial Mailing (percent)	Postcard prompt (percent)	Second mailing (percent)	Third mailing* (percent)	Telephone prompt (percent)
One	1/29/93 (100)	2/19/93 (100)	3/5/93 (87)	3/26/93 (65)	4/28/93 (50)
Two	2/26/93 (100)	3/19/93 (100)	4/2/93 (88)	4/30/93 (53)	5/15/93 (44)
Three	3/26/93 (100)	4/16/93 (100)	4/30/93 (89)	5/21/93 (53)	6/4/93 (43)
Four	4/23/93 (100)	5/7/93 (100)	5/21/93 (87)	6/11/93 (58)	6/18/93 (40)
Five	7/2/93 (100)	7/23/93 (100)	8/6/93 (90)	8/27/93 (59)	9/10/93 (58)
Six	7/23/93 (100)	7/30/93 (100)	8/13/93 (100)	8/27/93 (62)	9/10/93 (57)

* For Waves 2 through 6, the third questionnaire was mailed directly only to nonresponding faculty with home addresses. Questionnaires for nonresponding faculty without home addresses were sent to the Institutional Coordinator (see section 5.2.5).

As this exhibit shows, an increasingly higher percentage of faculty required second and third mailings for the last mailout waves. This was due, in part, to an accelerated follow-up schedule for the later waves.

5.2.2 Faculty Locating and Eligibility Screening Procedures

Locating of faculty was performed by specially trained interviewers. Locators were trained to follow a protocol for each respondent for which no productive contact was made. The following sources of information were used to find hard-to-reach respondents:

- name of the institution at which the individual was employed in the fall of 1992
- any available home or campus address or telephone numbers
- faculty member's department
- employee ID (oftentimes the employee's social security number)

Cases selected for the locating staff included cases to locate and refusals, as well as any respondent who had not received a successful prompt or who had not made firm arrangements to complete a telephone interview. The locating team compiled institution-by-institution lists of pending respondents. The folder for each institution (including course catalogs, faculty directories, lists and print-outs of locating information) was searched for any helpful information, and these data were entered onto a hardcopy call record for each faculty member. Commercially published directories of faculty were also searched for this information. Institutions which did not supply home phone numbers were prioritized for look-up. Locators were then instructed to attempt to contact sampled faculty using any of the available addresses or telephone numbers, calling the institution directly, calling the Institutional Coordinator, or calling the appropriate department secretary or chairperson.

In the event that these sources were not helpful in locating faculty, alternate sources were used, such as directory assistance and the state department of motor vehicles. When necessary, the locating team performed CBI/Trans Union searches of locating information. As information was found and confirmed, the case was forwarded for data entry and placed into the telephone center calling queue. Locators were trained to conduct telephone interviews (on hardcopy) with respondents they located.

In order to concentrate locating efforts on eligible faculty, calls were initiated to institution personnel to confirm eligibility of pending faculty. Institutions with large numbers of pending part-time faculty and institutions likely to have large numbers of ineligibles (medical schools, institutions with low participation rates, etc.) were prioritized. All interviewers and locating staff (including data entry specialists) received brief training in determining eligibility and were provided with a job aid to assist them in assessing respondent eligibility.

Interviewers were supplied with a list of Institutional Coordinators and the status of each institution's Affidavit of Nondisclosure. If a signed affidavit was currently on file for the coordinator, the interviewer was instructed to call the coordinator directly and ask for the eligibility status, the current employment status, and, if possible, additional locating information (such as home addresses or phone numbers, forwarding information, etc.) for all pending faculty listed on the "look-up" sheet provided by the locating shop. Interviewers could only request information from coordinators who had signed the affidavit and had it notarized. If no affidavit was on file, the interviewer had the option of asking for completion of the affidavit, or contacting personnel or payroll for further information. Contacts to institution personnel other than the coordinator were conducted within confidentiality constraints. To protect respondent confidentiality, interviewers were not allowed to identify themselves as representing NSOPF-93, or to reveal that the people they were asking about were in the NSOPF-93 faculty sample.

Combined institution questionnaire prompts and eligibility calls. To maximize efficiency and to minimize the number of calls to each institution, eligibility calling was combined with the institution questionnaire prompt. This occurred with those institutions where the institution respondent was the same as the Institutional Coordinator, and an institution questionnaire prompt was required. Combined calls continued until the first round of institution questionnaire prompting was completed on December 18, 1993.

Eligibility calls to institutions with low faculty participation rates. After January 3, 1994 eligibility calls were resumed only to those 75 institutions with a faculty participation rate of 60 percent or less. These calls were combined with institution questionnaire prompts whenever a prompt to the institution was required. However, all institutions with a participation rate of less than 60 percent were contacted—not merely those for whom a prompt was required.

5.2.3 Faculty Refusal Conversion

During November and December, 1993, a number of new strategies were employed. A team of field staff especially skilled in working with refusals and hard-to-locate cases, and with experience working with institutions, were recruited for this phase of the data collection effort. Call histories were produced for respondents who initially refused to answer the survey. Refusals were reviewed, grouped, and appropriate follow-up strategies and supervisor reinforcement put into place for field and office interviewers. Special tools were designed to aid in refusal conversion. One was a fact sheet to help refusal conversion specialists answer refusers' specific objections to participation in the study. Issues on which the fact sheet focused included the survey's confidentiality and purpose and concerns of particular groups of faculty (part-time faculty, retired faculty, research faculty, faculty at religious institutions and faculty who said they were not typical of faculty at their institution).

Another tool that aided refusal conversion was an abbreviated faculty questionnaire designed for use in a telephone interview. This questionnaire consisted of critical items and other items selected on the basis of analytical needs where NCES required unimputed data for the faculty questionnaire. The abbreviated questionnaire was specifically used only for refusal conversion. It was not designed for refusal aversion. During the intensive data collection period of November 11, 1993 and December 31, 1993, 636 abbreviated questionnaires were completed with respondents who initially refused to participate in the NSOPF-93 faculty survey. After gaining respondent cooperation in answering the abbreviated faculty questionnaire, refusal conversion specialists were trained to ask respondents for their cooperation in completing the full questionnaire.

For purposes of data entry and imputation, completed abbreviated questionnaires were treated like all other questionnaires. Items excluded from the abbreviated questionnaire were considered missing data. A copy of the abbreviated questionnaire appears in Appendix H.

5.2.4 Follow-up with Specific Subgroups of Faculty

Throughout the follow-up phase of the data collection process, special attention was paid to increasing absolute numbers of respondents in particular faculty subgroups: for black, non-Hispanics; Hispanics; Asian/Pacific Islanders; those whose race was unknown (i.e. missing a racial identification on the faculty sampling list); research institution faculty; and part-time faculty. In order to focus on the research target, case lists prioritizing these faculty subgroups were provided to field staff and to phone shop staff. In addition, a special mailing was sent in November, 1993 to the following subgroups of nonresponding faculty: Wave 5 and Wave 6 faculty; and Wave 1 through Wave 4 faculty in medical or research schools and two-year colleges. These special efforts, particularly those taken in November and December, 1993, increased response rates for minority and part-time faculty, largely because of an increase in completed cases in which race or part-time/full-time status was initially unknown.

5.2.5 Faculty Follow-up by Institutional Coordinators

All Institutional Coordinators who had signed the NCES' Affidavit of Nondisclosure and had it notarized were asked to carry out three tasks vis-a-vis nonresponding faculty. Coordinators who did *not* supply home addresses for their faculty were asked to mail the third questionnaire packet to the home (or summer) address of nonresponding faculty. The questionnaire packets were prepackaged and prestamped in advance, so that the coordinator's task was limited to writing in the faculty member's address. Coordinators who supplied home addresses were given a list of nonresponding faculty and asked to prompt them for the return of their questionnaires. Coordinators were also asked to identify faculty who were listed in error and not eligible for the study. The initial mailout of these materials, for institutions in faculty mailout Waves 1-4, occurred on May 7, 1993. These materials were mailed in August, 1993 for institutions in all faculty mailout waves. Appendix N includes a copy of the letter accompanying the packet mailed to Institutional Coordinators.

To assure that these follow-up requests received prompt attention from coordinators, telephone prompting staff contacted each coordinator's office to alert them to the packet and its contents and to answer any questions about their role. Additional contact with coordinators to confirm eligibility of nonresponding faculty continued through January, 1994.

For the May mailing, out of 439 coordinators, 131 were asked to prompt and to send questionnaires to the homes of 3,355 nonresponding faculty. The other 308 coordinators were asked only to prompt 7,475 nonresponding faculty.

The second mailing to coordinators occurred prior to the resumption of interviewer follow-up. Coordinators for Waves 1-4 institutions were mailed follow-up packets on August 18-19, 1993; the coordinators for Waves 5-6 received similar packets on August 23, 1993. The telephone center staff contacted coordinators to notify them of the scheduled mailout and to request their assistance. Telephone notification began on August 11, 1993 and was completed by September 3, 1993. Of the coordinators who received packets, 109 confirmed either by telephone or in writing that they had followed up with nonresponding faculty at their institutions. Only nine coordinators explicitly refused to implement the request for help.

5.2.6 Faculty Telephone Interviews

Telephone interviewing was conducted using a CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing) system. Telephone prompting and interviewing of nonresponding faculty began on April 28, 1993 and ended on December 18, 1993, with a suspension of activities in the months of July and August. A total of 4,995 faculty, or 19 percent of all completed cases, completed the CATI questionnaire. The CATI version of the faculty questionnaire was programmed in AutoQuest, a commercially available software package. Telephone follow-up activities were coordinated with mail follow-up. Cases were activated for telephone follow-up in waves, according to their initial mailing date (see Exhibit 5-3). Interviewers were instructed to conduct a CATI interview only after the second telephone prompt, but were given greater discretion to conduct a telephone interview for cases mailed late in the field period.

5.2.7 Field Interviewing and Locating

Approximately 20 field interviewers who were expert locators and refusal converters and two field managers were employed during November and December, 1993, to assist with the end of the data collection effort. Almost 1,200 temporary refusal and unlocatable cases were assigned to field staff. Field production was monitored daily, and regular feedback was given in order to keep production levels high. Staffing was reconfigured and adjusted based on the caseload and last known location of the cases. Field staff completed approximately 500 questionnaires with faculty as telephone interviews. These interviews were then data-entered using the data entry program for self-administered questionnaires.

5.2.8 Faculty Data Retrieval

A subset of telephone interviewers were trained to conduct retrieval of missing critical information from completed faculty self-administered questionnaires. Twenty-seven percent of the 20,785 self-administered questionnaires were identified for retrieval because of missing data in one or more of the critical items. Respondents were called and asked to supply the missing data for these items. In approximately 84 percent of the cases, respondents were able to provide some or all of the missing information. The remaining 16 percent were determined to be complete based on policy decisions reviewed with NCES. All faculty questionnaire retrieval activities were completed on January 29, 1994. (Retrieval is discussed further in Chapter 6. A list of faculty questionnaire critical items appears in Appendix I.)

5.3 Data Collection Results: Faculty Questionnaire

Exhibits 5-3 through 5-6 provide a summary of the NSOPF-93 data collection results for the faculty questionnaire. These exhibits report unweighted response rates.

Exhibit 5-3 illustrates the faculty response rates for each wave of questionnaires by initial mailing date. As faculty lists were received and processed, and faculty were sampled, questionnaires were assembled into large batches for mailing. The initial questionnaire packets were followed by at least two follow-up questionnaire mailings. Telephone prompting and interviewing followed for nonrespondents. As indicated, the response rates varied from a high of 90.1 percent for Wave 1 to a low of 77.9 percent for Wave 6. These data suggest that faculty who received their questionnaires early in the field period—usually when classes were still in session—had a greater likelihood of responding than faculty who received a later mailing.

Exhibit 5-3: Faculty response rates by initial mailing date

Initial mailing date (by wave)	Eligible sample	Completed questionnaires		Total completed questionnaires	Faculty response rate (unweighted percent)
		Self-administered	Telephone interview		
1. January 29, 1993	9,691	7,536	1,193	8,729	90.1
2. February 26, 1993	6,635	4,986	899	5,885	88.7
3. March 27, 1993	3,034	2,160	502	2,662	87.7
4. April 24, 1993	3,337	2,239	590	2,829	84.8
5. July 2, 1993	5,769	3,229	1,435	4,664	80.8
6. July 16, 1993	1,298	635	376	1,011	77.9
Total	**29,764**	**20,785**	**4,995**	**25,780**	**86.6**

Exhibit 5-4 illustrates the unweighted response rates for faculty by institution level and control. As the exhibit depicts, faculty at private two-year institutions returned completed questionnaires at the highest rate (90.3 percent, compared to an unweighted average response rate of 86.6 percent). Faculty at private four-year institutions responded to the faculty questionnaire at the lowest rate. Response rates for faculty at private four-year institutions were nearly 6 percentage points lower than those of faculty at private two-year institutions. Faculty at both types of public institutions (two-year and four-year) completed questionnaires at higher rates than did faculty at private four-year institutions. But response rates for public institution faculty did not attain the level that faculty at private two-year institutions attained (response rates of 87.8 percent and 87.2 percent, respectively, compared to 90.3 percent). While response rates at private institutions varied widely by type (two-year or four-year), there was hardly any difference in response rates for faculty from different types of public institutions.

Exhibit 5-4: Faculty response rates by level and control of institution

Level and control of institution*	Total sample	Sample		Faculty response rate (unweighted percent)
		Eligible	Complete	
Public four-year	11,494	11,029	9,682	87.8
Public two-year	10,525	9,913	8,646	87.2
Private four-year	8,982	8,483	7,146	84.2
Private two-year	353	339	306	90.3
Total	**31,354**	**29,764**	**25,780**	**86.6**

*The "level and control" classification does not match sampling stratum classification (Exhibit 5-5) because institutions sampled in the "unknown" categories in NSOPF-93 were reclassified after data collection was complete.

Exhibit 5-5 displays the unweighted faculty response rates across the 15 strata used for sampling institutions. Faculty at public liberal arts schools (with a 96.7 percent response rate) and faculty at private two-year institutions (92.5 percent) returned questionnaires at the highest rates. Faculty at private medical schools (73.5 percent) and faculty at other private schools (72.1 percent) returned questionnaires at considerably lower rates than faculty at other types of schools. Twelve of the 15 strata represented pairs of institution types, differing only by their public or private status (i.e., public comprehensive vs. private comprehensive; public medical vs. private medical). In five of the six pairs, faculty at public institutions returned questionnaires at higher rates. The gap in faculty response rates between public institution faculty and private institution faculty was widest (13.7 percentage points) in the paired strata for "other" institutions. Only faculty working at private two-year institutions returned questionnaires at higher rates (92.5 percent) than their colleagues working at public two-year institutions (87.3 percent). The difference in faculty response rates between public and private institutions was smallest in comprehensive institutions (a difference of 1.6 percent) and in "unknown" institutions (a difference of 1.5 percent).

Exhibit 5-5: Faculty response rates by institution sampling stratum

Institution stratum	Total sample	Sample		Faculty response rate (unweighted percent)
		Eligible	Complete	
Private other Ph.D.	1,523	1,422	1,141	80.2
Public comprehensive	5,518	5,308	4,718	88.9
Private comprehensive	2,627	2,510	2,191	87.3
Public liberal arts	91	90	87	96.7
Private liberal arts	2,370	2,281	2,067	90.6
Public medical	800	764	633	82.9
Private medical	380	321	236	73.5
Private religious	317	291	244	83.8
Public two-year	9,955	9,382	8,187	87.3
Private two-year	276	268	248	92.5
Public other	232	219	188	85.8
Private other	540	509	367	72.1
Public unknown	638	597	509	85.3
Private unknown	151	136	114	83.8
Research/public other Ph.D.	5,936	5,666	4,850	85.6
Total	**31,354**	**29,764**	**25,780**	**86.6**

Exhibit 5-6 reports unweighted faculty response rates by faculty sampling characteristics. For purposes of this table, individual characteristics were obtained from lists provided by participating institutions. As indicated, white, non-Hispanic faculty had the highest unweighted response rate (89.1 percent) and American Indian/Alaskan Natives the lowest (81.3 percent), although the difference between these groups was relatively small—only 8 percent. Females were higher responders (88.5 percent) than males (86.4 percent); full-time faculty (88.8 percent) were more likely to respond than part-time (83.5 percent) faculty. The unweighted response rate for faculty in the four NEH-selected disciplines (4,216/4,861 or 86.7 percent) matched almost identically the response rate for the entire sample (86.6 percent). Non-NEH faculty responded at a slightly higher rate than average.

Exhibit 5-6: Faculty response rates by faculty sampling characteristics

Individual characteristic[*]	**Subgroup**	**Total sample**	**Sample**		**Faculty response rate (unweighted percent)**
			Eligible	**Complete**	
Gender	Unknown	1,979	1,857	1,416	76.3
	Male	16,707	15,879	13,720	86.4
	Female	12,668	12,028	10,644	88.5
Race[*]	Unknown	8,639	7,967	6,507	81.7
	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	99	96	78	81.3
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1,185	1,132	993	87.7
	Hispanic	1,264	1,199	1,033	86.2
	Black, non-Hispanic	2,577	2,458	2,097	85.3
	White, non-Hispanic	17,590	16,912	15,072	89.1
Full/part time status	Unknown	3,695	3,380	2,824	83.6
	Full-time	17,996	17,596	15,618	88.8
	Part-time	9,663	8,788	7,338	83.5
Discipline	Unknown	1,814	1,647	1,316	79.9
	Non-NEH	24,480	23,256	20,248	87.1
	History	941	904	804	88.9
	Foreign language	1,043	995	829	83.3
	English	2,458	2,379	2,069	87.0
	Philosophy/religion	618	583	514	88.2
	All respondents	**31,354**	**29,764**	**25,780**	**86.6**

[*] As reported by institutions on faculty lists.

Completion rates were higher for faculty whose home address was available (89.6 percent, unweighted) than for those faculty whose home address was unavailable (82.2 percent, unweighted). As Exhibit 5-7 shows, this relationship held for all faculty regardless of employment status. Faculty who could be followed-up at home were more likely to complete the questionnaire than those who could not be followed-up at home.

Exhibit 5-7: Response rates for faculty members whose institutions supplied their home address, by employment status

	HOME ADDRESS AVAILABLE				HOME ADDRESS MISSING			
Full-time, part-time status	**Eligible**	**Complete**	**Unweighted response rate (percent)**	**Weighted response rate (percent)**	**Eligible**	**Complete**	**Unweighted response rate (percent)**	**Weighted response rate (percent)**
Unknown status	938	845	90.1	91.0	2,442	1,979	81.0	78.3
Full-time	11,186	10,117	90.4	88.6	6,410	5,501	85.8	83.3
Part-time	5,508	4,840	87.9	86.3	3,280	2,498	76.2	74.3
TOTAL	17,632	15,802	89.6	88.0	12,132	9,978	82.2	79.6

5.4 Institution Survey

5.4.1 Initial Mailing to Institution Respondent

On September 10, 1993, the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire, addressed to the institution respondent (if one was named), was mailed to each institution that had already participated in the study by providing a faculty list, and to institutions that had not provided a list. This mailing included a cover letter (signed by the then-Commissioner of NCES, Emerson J. Elliott) and an informational brochure which described the purpose of NSOPF-93 and highlighted key findings from the previous study. If an institution respondent was not specifically named, a questionnaire was sent to the Institutional Coordinator (if formally identified by the institution) or the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). (For 44.2 percent of the institutions who provided faculty lists, the Institutional Coordinator was named by the CAO as the institution respondent.) For nonparticipating institutions, or institutions which did not formally name a coordinator, the questionnaire was sent to the CAO. Separate cover letters, copies of which appear in Appendix M, were mailed to participating and nonparticipating institutions.

5.4.2 Postcard Prompts to Institutions

Two postcard prompts were mailed to institutions, thanking them for their cooperation and reminding them to complete the questionnaire, if they had not already done so. The first prompt was mailed on September 24, 1993 and signed by the project director. The second was mailed on October 22, 1993 (two weeks following a second questionnaire mailing) and signed by the task coordinator. In each instance, institutions were encouraged to call the project 1-800 number if they had any questions or anticipated any significant delays in completing the questionnaire. A copy of this postcard appears in Appendix M.

5.4.3 Second Questionnaire Mailing to Institutions

A second questionnaire was mailed to non-responding institutions on October 8, 1993, by regular first class mail. A cover letter from the project director accompanied the questionnaire. The letter assured institutions that there was still time to complete the questionnaire, and encouraged completion within the next few weeks.

5.4.4 Telephone Prompting and Follow-up of Institutions

Interviewers were given assignments from one of two groups of participating institutions: institutions which named the Institutional Coordinator as respondent, and institutions which named a separate institution respondent. Telephone prompting began on November 11, 1993. In those instances where the Institutional Coordinator was the same as the institution respondent, follow-up calls for the institution questionnaire were combined with other institutional contacts related to the faculty component of the study, including calls to determine the eligibility of nonresponding faculty, and calls to encourage coordinators to prompt faculty. Interviewers were trained in each type of follow-up activity before calling. By combining these contacts, it was hoped that any added burden to the coordinator would be minimized. Interviewers were trained to review all previous contact information (including the Record of Calls from the list collection phase of the study) prior to each call. If neither an Institutional Coordinator nor institution respondent had been designated by a participating institution, the initial call was made to the CAO's office.

The first wave of telephone prompting ended on December 23, 1993 prior to the holiday break. Prompting resumed on January 7, 1994 and continued until May 25, 1994. Institutions that failed to provide a list of faculty were treated as possible refusals. Initial follow-up to institutions which did not provide a list of faculty was conducted by the project Task Coordinator, beginning on November 10, 1993. Once the institution confirmed that they would complete the questionnaire, the Record of Calls was forwarded to interviewing staff for any additional follow-up.

Remails were requested by 226 institutions (23 percent). To eliminate unnecessary mail delays, questionnaires and other materials were faxed to institutions whenever possible. Institutions were encouraged to fax questionnaires as soon as they were completed, in addition to mailing the hardcopy. Institution respondents were also given a toll-free number to call with questions or comments; approximately 390 calls were made to the toll-free number.

The project task coordinator reviewed all refusals, and based on this review either called the institution personally, or forwarded the case to field staff for data collection by telephone. When appropriate, an offer was made to assist the institution by abstracting data from other information supplied by the institution.

5.4.5 Third Questionnaire Mailing to Institutions

On February 2, 1994 a third questionnaire mailing was sent by two-day priority mail to 383 nonresponding institutions. The third questionnaire mailing was necessary for two reasons. One was that the interruption of the holiday break, followed by the beginning of a new academic term, made it likely that the original request would be forgotten or lost. The second was that adverse weather conditions (including earthquakes on the West Coast and severe snowstorms and below-zero temperatures in the Midwest and East Coast) had caused some institutions to close for extended periods of time, further exacerbating staffing problems at these institutions. The letter informed institutions that the data collection period would be extended to accommodate institutions which had been affected by adverse conditions; other institutions were encouraged to complete and return the questionnaire by February 18, 1994. A personal, handwritten note was added to each letter, as appropriate, thanking respondents for their cooperation and addressing any concerns the institution may have previously expressed about the study.

The Association for Institutional Research (AIR) disseminated a project update memo in February to its membership through its electronic newsletter, underscoring AIR endorsement of the study and encouraging participation of sampled institutions. The memo noted that the deadline for participation had been extended to accommodate institutions affected by severe weather conditions, and thanked those institutions that had participated in NSOPF.

5.4.6 Interviewer-Assisted Data Collection at Institutions

In February and March, 1994 three experienced field interviewers were trained to collect data directly from institutions by telephone (or, in select instances, by visits to the institution). Field staff were selected on the basis of previous success in interviewing faculty on the faculty questionnaire. Individual training, including a walkthrough of the questionnaire, was conducted with each interviewer by the task coordinator. Each training lasted two hours, with an additional two hours provided for self-study. Interviewers were trained to work with the designated respondent or coordinator to identify offices within each institution that could provide specific kinds of data, and to contact those offices directly to provide the data. Difficulties experienced by institutions in coordinating data collection between different offices was a major source of delay; direct intervention by field staff eliminated that delay, and, as a result, was very successful.

Collecting data over the telephone was considered likely to be more problematic for larger institutions—particularly those with large numbers of research faculty or a wide range of types of faculty. Therefore, only small-to-medium sized institutions from nonresearch strata were targeted for telephone data collection. Within this group, institutions from strata with comparatively low response rates were specifically targeted, including public two-year and private religious institutions. Refusals and other nonparticipating institutions were targeted as well. Four nonresponding religious institutions clustered in the same city were selected for in-person field visits to collect data. Overall, 99 interviewer assisted questionnaires (95 telephone and four in-person) were completed. Although no attempt was made to validate interviews directly with the institution, data collected by interviewers was periodically validated by comparison to other institutional data.

5.4.7 Data Abstraction at Institutions

When an institution indicated it lacked the resources to supply key questionnaire data, or indicated that to do so would pose an unrealistic burden, an offer was made to assist the institution, if possible, by abstracting information from other data the institution provided, including:

- lists of faculty
- most recent IPEDS data, if available from the institution
- policy handbooks (containing benefits information and institutional definitions of faculty)

At institutions that were confirmed to be part of a state-wide, city-wide, or multi-campus system in which institutional benefits policy was the same for all institutions in the system, benefits data could sometimes be supplied by a system-wide source; system-wide benefits information could also be abstracted from common elements of data provided by sister institutions in the system. The task coordinator reviewed lists used to compile faculty counts for completeness of relevant information. The accuracy of any data abstracted was confirmed with the institution.

5.4.8 Institution Data Retrieval

All data retrieval was conducted by trained project staff. Retrieval was conducted on a flow basis, beginning on October 5, 1993, and ending on May 26, 1994. One interviewer was trained to perform both the initial case edit, which identified cases requiring retrieval, and the retrieval call. As the initial case edit was performed, cases with missing critical items were flagged for retrieval. "Don't know" and "refused" were considered legitimate responses and not retrieved. Additional cases were flagged for retrieval when inter-item discrepancies or out-of-range responses involving critical items were discovered during a second edit performed by the task coordinator prior to computer assisted data entry (CADE), or during CADE (which ran several consistency checks as part of its program). The data abstraction procedures outlined above were utilized when the information was otherwise unavailable from the institution. One hundred seventy-eight cases (20 percent) were identified as requiring retrieval. Retrieval calls were completed for 172 institution questionnaires (97 percent).

5.5 Data Collection Results: Institution Questionnaire

Exhibits 5-8 to 5-10 provide a summary of the NSOPF-93 data collection results for the institution questionnaire. These exhibits report unweighted response rates.

Exhibit 5-8 illustrates the unweighted institution questionnaire response rates by institution stratum and by type and control of institution. In general, the response rate of institutions to the institution questionnaire was quite high, with an unweighted response rate of 90.6 percent for all institutions. All eligible private two-year, private religious and public "other" institutions completed the questionnaire. Public institutions responded to the institution questionnaire at lower rates than did private institutions. The lowest response rate (66.7 percent), found in the public liberal arts stratum, affects so few institutions as to have little impact on the overall rate of response to the questionnaire. The stratum that included the largest number of institutions, the public two-year stratum (with 316 eligible institutions) showed one of the highest rates of response (94.3 percent) among the 15 strata.

Exhibit 5-8: Institution questionnaire response rates by institution sampling stratum

Institution stratum	Total sample	Sample		Institution response rate (unweighted percent)
		Eligible	Complete	
Private other Ph.D.	46	46	39	84.8
Public comprehensive	159	159	144	90.6
Private comprehensive	83	82	71	86.6
Public liberal arts	3	3	2	66.7
Private liberal arts	68	68	66	97.1
Public medical	25	25	20	80.0
Private medical	10	10	9	90.0
Private religious	20	18	18	100.0
Public two-year	317	316	298	94.3
Private two-year	11	10	10	100.0
Public other	7	7	7	100.0
Private other	26	24	19	79.2
Public unknown	23	19	18	94.7
Private unknown	8	7	7	100.0
Research/public other Ph.D.	168	168	144	85.7

Level and control of institution*	Total sample	Sample		Institution response rate (unweighted percent)
		Eligible	Complete	
Public four-year	332	331	292	88.2
Public two-year	337	333	314	94.3
Private four-year	290	284	252	88.7
Private two-year	15	14	14	100.0
Total	**974**	**962**	**872**	**90.6**

*Sampling stratum classification does not match the "level and control" classification because institutions sampled in the "unknown" categories in NSOPF-93 were reclassified after data collection was completed.

Exhibit 5-9 breaks down the institution response rate by mode of administration. Ninety-nine questionnaires were completed with the assistance of an interviewer. This figure represented 10.3 percent of the total eligible institution sample and 11.4 percent of completed questionnaires.

Exhibit 5-9: Institution questionnaire response rates by mode of administration

Mode of administration	Faculty list participating (unweighted percent)	Faculty list non-participating (unweighted percent)	Total responding (unweighted percent)
Self-administered questionnaires (percent of total sample)	688 (84.2)	85 (58.6)	773 (80.3)
Field data collection (percent of total sample)	72 (8.8)	27 (18.6)	99 (10.3)
Total completed (percent of total sample)	760 (93.0)	112 (77.2)	872 (90.6)
Total sample	817	145	962

Exhibit 5-10 compares the institution questionnaire response rate on the NSOPF-93 full-scale study with the NSOPF-93 field test and the 1987-88 field test and full-scale study. As the exhibit shows, there was a 2.3 percentage point improvement in the response rate of the NSOPF-93 institution survey from the NSOPF-88 institution survey.

Exhibit 5-10: Institution response rates by cycle

NSOPF cycle	Number eligible	Completed questionnaires	Response rate (unweighted percent)
1987 field test	50	40	80.0
1988 main study	480	424	88.3
1992 field test (Expanded core) (Augmentation)	120 (49) (71)	94 (40) (54)	78.3 (81.6) (76.1)
1993 main study (Participating) (Non-participating)	962 (817) (145)	872 (760) (112)	90.6 (93.0) (77.2)

The data collection period for NSOPF-93 lasted 10 weeks longer than the data collection period for NSOPF-88 (34 weeks, compared to 24 weeks). This reflects the larger sample size as well as the impact of severe weather conditions previously described. But the data collection effort also revealed that institutions feel increasingly burdened by research requests. In some instances, institutions had downsized the institutional staff that would normally process such requests. The 91 percent response rate achieved for the NSOPF-93 full-scale study would not have been possible without the direct involvement of interviewing staff in data collection and other efforts to minimize institutional burden.

6. Data Control and Data Processing

6.1 Overview

This chapter describes the procedures used to process and to prepare faculty list data for sampling and to transform responses from the faculty and institution questionnaires into computerized data files. A total of 872 institution questionnaires (all hardcopy) and 25,780 faculty questionnaires were processed, including 20,785 self-administered and 4,995 computer-assisted telephone interviews. NORC used commercially-available software, AutoQuest, for all data capture.

The procedures to be discussed include: receipt control and processing of faculty list data for sampling, monitoring the receipt of completed questionnaires, preparing self-administered questionnaires for data entry, editing self-administered questionnaires for overall adequacy and completeness, data-entry, flagging cases with missing or inconsistent data through automated consistency checks, retrieving missing data, coding responses, quality control of data entry, and preparing documents for archival storage.

6.2 Faculty List Processing and Preparation for Sampling

The sampling frame for the faculty survey was drawn from faculty lists provided by 817 participating institutions. Each participating institution was asked to provide a hard-copy list, a machine-readable list, documentation of the list format, and the names of institution staff involved in preparing the list. Upon receipt, each list was subjected to a cursory review for completeness and adequacy. Project staff were trained expressly to recontact institution staff to retrieve missing information and to resolve list discrepancies. These staff used the Faculty List Documentation Form (see Appendix K) provided by the institution to contact those persons involved in preparing the faculty list. If the institution did not provide this form, staff recontacted the Institutional Coordinator. In the event that the faculty list was incomplete—that is, some level of locating or sampling information was missing—staff explained the importance of these data to the sampling design and handled any concerns or questions which arose regarding release of these data. Special efforts were made to describe confidentiality procedures and the sampling methodology used. The missing information was then retrieved in the way most accommodating for the Institutional Coordinator (through the mail, fax, or via the Internet).

Once the list of faculty (and supporting documentation about the format and preparation of the list) was reviewed, it was receipted as complete into the NSOPF contractor's survey monitoring system (SMS), a microcomputer-based system used to track all sampled institutions and their status. A folder that contained all of the relevant materials was prepared for each institution. Processing of hardcopy lists required more effort than processing electronic faculty lists. If an institution provided a hardcopy list only, sampling staff followed these steps to create an electronic file in the required format:

1. Each line (or each faculty member listed) was numbered sequentially. Lists were inspected to see if all sampling variables were included. If not, other materials in the sampling folder were inspected to see if any information could be gleaned from them and included on the hardcopy list.

2. All sampling variables were then coded to match specifications for sampling (e.g., gender was coded as 1=male/2=female; race/ethnicity was coded numerically). The coding specifications followed the same specifications in the list preparation instructions sent to the institution (see Appendix K). In addition, faculty discipline was coded numerically to indicate NEH and non-NEH status.

3. The sampling variables, along with faculty names, addresses, and telephone numbers, were data-entered into an electronic file for that institution. (If addresses were not already on the hardcopy file, but were available elsewhere, this information was not entered until the sampling step had been completed and then only for the sampled faculty.)

If an institution provided an electronic file, sampling staff inspected the file on-line to ensure that all coding specifications were followed for the sampling variables and that the file layout was correct. Programming staff created utilities which enabled the automated reformatting of those files with incorrect layouts, and the recoding of sampling variables when necessary. In addition, an automated utility was employed to streamline the coding of NEH/non-NEH teaching disciplines, although this step still required more detailed effort on the part of sampling staff. This utility searched the electronic file for the verbatim entry of teaching discipline, and created a collapsed codeframe of each unique discipline along with the number of occurrences (or, number of faculty in each discipline). Sampling staff then inspected the codeframe and assigned a numerical code to each unique teaching discipline to indicate its NEH/non-NEH status. Once the collapsed frame was coded in this way, the utility then assigned these numerical codes to each faculty member on the faculty list.

When all sampling data were coded, an automated program captured list counts and entered them into a discrepancy module of the SMS. Sampling staff then reviewed discrepancy reports, comparing the faculty totals from the lists with data from the most recent IPEDS (NCES's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System). In some instances, the numbers of faculty on the list differed greatly from those from the IPEDS. The discrepancy reports allowed sampling staff to investigate possible areas of discrepancy by breaking down the faculty totals by gender and full- or part-time status. In this way, it was easy to identify, for example, institutions who had left part-time staff completely off of their list, or those who had reversed the gender code. Resolution of list discrepancies also involved recontacting the list preparer or Institutional Coordinator (see section 4.2.5). If the source of the discrepancy was identified by sampling staff, an attempt was made to confirm the diagnosis of the source of the discrepancy and to retrieve from the institution corrected sampling information. On the other hand, if no obvious source of error was identified, the staff explained the problem to the Institutional Coordinator and attempted to find a reason for the discrepancy.

Machine-readable lists (whether data-entered from hardcopy or provided on diskette or tape) which had passed through discrepancy review were uploaded directly into an electronic sampling program, which selected the sample members based on programmed selection algorithms. Lists of sampled faculty at participating institutions in the field test were cross-checked against lists of field test participants at those institutions to ensure that they were not selected again. To minimize respondent burden, OMB restrictions prohibited NSOPF-93 from resampling and reinterviewing individuals who participated in the 1992 field test.

Sampling and data collection information for sampled respondents was uploaded into an AutoQuest program, which then generated respondent tracking files for coordinated mail and telephone follow-up. The program assigned a unique identification number to each sampled record. All pertinent information was also uploaded into the Survey Monitoring System (SMS)—faculty IDs, names and locating data, and sampling information—for purposes of tracking and case management.

6.3 Receipt Control and Monitoring of Institution and Faculty Questionnaires

When completed faculty and institution self-administered questionnaires (SAQs) were received, receipt control staff checked each document for completeness and assigned a disposition code indicating that the case was complete. If a questionnaire was returned as undeliverable, faculty directories and/or address information supplied by each institution were reviewed for an alternate address. If none was available, it was forwarded to telephone staff for locating. If a package was returned as undeliverable with a forwarding address, the new address was entered into the SMS tracking and monitoring system for future follow-up.

Case dispositions for the faculty questionnaire were updated directly into the TNMS (Telephone Number Management System) component of AutoQuest, which delivered pending cases to interviewers for telephone prompting and interviewing. Respondents who had completed self-administered questionnaires (SAQs) were, therefore, removed from the queue for telephone follow-up once the questionnaire was receipted. Case dispositions were updated to indicate whether the questionnaire was complete or contained items that required retrieval. The TNMS was linked through weekly updates to the SMS tracking and monitoring system.

Computer-assisted telephone interviewing was not used for the institution questionnaire; therefore, institution questionnaire dispositions were entered directly into the SMS tracking and monitoring system.

6.4 Data Entry and Coding

6.4.1 Data Entry

Both CADE (computer-assisted data entry) and CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing) were performed using AutoQuest. Separate CADE programs were developed for the self-administered faculty and institution questionnaires. A CATI program, equivalent to CADE, was also developed for the faculty questionnaire, allowing online data entry of telephone interviews by interviewers. The CADE/CATI systems were designed to:

- ensure that all entries conformed to valid ranges of codes defined for the particular question stem;
- enforce skip patterns automatically;
- conduct inter-item consistency checks where appropriate; and
- display the full question and answer texts for verbatim responses.

As part of the statistical quality control program, 100 percent verification was conducted of a randomly selected subsample of 10 percent of all faculty and institution questionnaires entered in CADE. These cases were randomly pre-selected before each set of questionnaires was data-entered. When a questionnaire was flagged for verification, it was then re-keyed by a different data entry operator than had originally keyed the data. A data entry supervisor then independently reviewed and compared the results of both data entry events; any discrepancies were resolved by referring to the hardcopy questionnaire and making corrections to the final questionnaire data. The error rate was less than one-half of one percent for all items keyed.

Quality assurance for faculty interviews entered in CATI consisted of random online monitoring by supervisors. On a daily basis, a set of times for monitoring and stations to be monitored was automatically generated for each monitor. The program for creating these lists took as inputs the IDs of active prompting, retrieval, and CATI stations; the duration of each monitoring session; the sampling rate; and the total length of time to schedule. The monitor station allowed the supervisor to listen to the interview and to view the data the interviewer entered on screen. Any errors or omissions (including deviations in reading questions, failure to probe or follow instructions, or errors in recording of data) were recorded. The outcome of each monitoring event was entered into the system via an AutoQuest application.

6.4.2 Faculty Questionnaire Coding

Coding of faculty questionnaires was conducted using a computer-assisted coding (CAC) system, which also used AutoQuest software. Coding of academic discipline was performed online during interviewing or data entry. All other faculty questionnaire coding was performed as a post-processing step. Three kinds of coding were performed for the faculty questionnaire:

Academic discipline. Coding of academic discipline for the respondent's principal teaching field, principal area of research, degree fields, and courses taught (Questions A12, A13, B16C, and C23A-E) was performed online during interviewing or data entry. Online coding for the self-administered questionnaires took place *only* if the respondent had not already provided a code, but had written some sort of codable text. In these cases, the data entry clerk was prompted to enter verbatim the name of the discipline and follow the same procedure as telephone interviewers who performed online coding of academic discipline.

A two-step coding process was designed so that interviewers and data entry staff would not have to page down through the entire list to find an appropriate code. The first step was to select the major category or area. Categories included were those shown in upper case letters on the hardcopy questionnaire, many of which have subcategories. After the major category was selected, the second step was to select the specific discipline from the subcategories displayed in the second screen. The appropriate code was then selected and entered next to the verbatim entry.

Quality assurance checks for coding of academic discipline were performed as part of the regular quality control procedures for CADE and CATI. However, coding of academic discipline for CADE cases in which the respondent had not supplied a code was subjected to a 100 percent verification. Erroneous codes were recoded to a valid code after examination of the case and its verbatim entry. Cases in which the respondent (or interviewer) had selected a code of "900" ("Other") were also reviewed and coded to a more specific value whenever possible.

IPEDS codes. Coding of institution names from which respondents received their academic degrees was a multi-stage process performed after data entry in CADE or CATI was complete. Institution names were reported at Question B16E, where respondents had the opportunity to report as many as four academic degrees received. Coding was performed using an electronic file of the 1991-92 IPEDS directory, which included IPEDS code, city, two-letter state abbreviation, and institution name for 10,258 less-than-two-year, two-year, and four-year or more institutions. After both CADE and CATI production had been completed, a file of responses to institution name and location was created for each of the four opportunities to report on an academic degree. These files contained a total of 61,759 institution name mentions. The respondent data file from the first line of Question B16, highest degree, was electronically compared to the IPEDS directory file and all exact matches on both institution name and city were automatically coded. Thirty-four percent of the institutions in this file were matched and automatically coded.

A combination of techniques was used to code the remaining institutions. First, the uncodable institutions were sorted by state and institution name, and obvious variations of institution names, for which IPEDS codes were available, were identified and coded. In addition, an automated system was designed for coders to access IPEDS data by city or by institution name. The coders entered a search string at each level, and the program searched each database for possible matches. This combination of techniques enabled the coding of an additional 61 percent of the highest degree institutions, bringing the total to 95 percent. Finally, the remaining five percent of highest degree institution mentions were reviewed individually and coded when possible. The final total coding rate was 97.8 percent. The remaining 2.2 percent of highest degree institutions remained uncoded or received codes for "Non-U.S. unknown" or for "U.S. not listed."

After confirming the accuracy of coding in this file, the verbatim responses and their selected IPEDS codes were added to the IPEDS directory. The expanded frame was used to code the remaining responses (Question B16, lines 2-4). This increased the frequency of finding exact matches for the automated coding of the remaining files. After all four degree files had been coded, the remaining institution names that had not yet been coded were examined individually and coded when possible.

If respondents reported the name of a multi-campus university system without specifying the particular branch from which the degree was obtained, the flagship institution of that system was coded. For example, if respondents wrote "University of Wisconsin" without specifying a branch campus, their institution was coded as the University of Wisconsin at Madison. If respondents reported the name of a graduate or professional institution without specifying the name of the larger IPEDS institution of which it was a part (e.g. "John F. Kennedy School of Government" rather than "Harvard University"), other means were employed. Staff consulted reference books, university catalogs and cross-checked respondents' answers to find the name of the institution to which to assign the answer. NCES materials were consulted to check for institutions which had closed or had changed their names.

The file was then sorted by IPEDS code and checked against an NCES-supplied electronic master list of IPEDS codes. The file was scanned to find discrepancies between verbatims and expected IPEDS codes. Discrepancies were reconciled by attaching the correct IPEDS code to the verbatim naming the institution. After the entire coding effort was completed, all institution data were exported and sorted by IPEDS code. All institutions were checked in this manner and corrected whenever errors were encountered. The final product contains a negligible error rate of 0.2 percent or less.

Coding of foreign institutions was also handled automatically. During the coding process described above, institutions outside the U.S. were identified as uncodable using the IPEDS frame and flagged as foreign institutions in the database. The verbatim text for the name of country was then electronically compared to the list of codes for countries in the NSOPF-88 faculty data file. Nearly all non-U.S. institutions were automatically coded in this manner. The remaining uncodable institutions were manually coded after hardcopy inspection by coding staff. The weighted proportions of respondents who received degrees from non-U.S. institutions were as follows: 5.3 percent for the highest degree listed, 6.3 percent for the second highest degree, 10.9 percent for the third highest degree, and 19.9 percent for fourth highest degree.

Country. Country was coded at Question B16E(1-4) when the institution reported was foreign and could not be coded within the IPEDS codeframe and at Questions F56 and F57, which asked for the respondent's country of birth and/or citizenship. Geo-coding of foreign countries was also performed automatically after data entry of the questionnaire in CADE or CATI was complete. The codeframe was constructed using the codes compiled for NSOPF-88, with additional codes added as necessary. A few foreign institutions were manually coded based on city (for example, Moscow) or institution name (for example, The Sorbonne).

"Other specify" and verbatim text. Coding of text entered at Questions A2, A9, E47P, was performed after CADE and CATI were complete. In most cases, the text was coded to the existing codes. For Questions A2, A9, and E47P, the codeframes were expanded to accommodate verbatim responses that could not be coded to the existing options.

- Question A2—codes added for administrative titles or positions listed as respondent's principal activity during the 1992 Fall Term are:

9.	Dean, acting/interim/associate/assistant dean
10.	Chair, acting/associate/assistant chair
11.	Director/head/coordinator (of a program, group, field of study)
12.	President, chief
13.	Assistant to the president
14.	Vice president, associate/assistant vice president
15.	Administrator, manager
16.	Chancellor, provost
17.	Chaplain
18.	Advisor, counselor
19.	Librarian, library director
20.	Registrar
21.	Secretary, miscellaneous clerical
23.	Athletic director, coach
24.	Other

- Question A9—respondent's academic rank, title, or position during the 1992 Fall Term. Codes added to the codeframe are:

7.	Visiting faculty/teacher/unspecified
8.	Professor emeritus
9.	Dean
10.	Chairperson
11.	Director, head, coordinator, executive
12.	Administration, administrator
13.	Management, supervisor
14.	Postdoctoral
15.	Research fellow/scientist/professor
16.	President, chancellor
17.	Chaplain
18.	Counselor, mentor, advisor
19.	Librarian, curator
20.	Research associate/assistant
21.	Secretary, miscellaneous clerical
22.	Adjunct faculty/teacher/unspecified
23.	Coach
24.	Other

- Question E47P—respondents recorded income from two additional "other" sources. All verbatim entries were then reviewed and additional codes were created:

P1.	Grants/fellowships (local/state/federal)
P2.	Retirement/pension/Social Security/unemployment
P3.	Military/pension/retirement/other military
P4.	Alimony/child support/spouse income
P5.	Dividends/annuities/trust fund/stocks
P6.	Government (local/state/federal)

P7. Loans
P8. Real estate, rental properties
P9. Other income

An additional 28 items with "other specify" response choices were eligible for coding based on verbatim responses, but were not coded. Several of these items retained only a small percentage of codable items. Others had key data missing, making them impossible to code. One question, F53B, which included verbatim responses to the "other specify" option for respondent race/ethnicity, was left unchanged on the data file. No effort was made to code the verbatim responses for Question F53B.

6.4.3 Faculty Questionnaire Eligibility Review

At the close of data collection for the faculty survey, all completed faculty questionnaires were reviewed to determine if any respondents were ineligible. This review was done on several levels. First, the responses to Question A9 in the faculty questionnaire, "Which of the following best describes your academic rank, title, or position at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?" were examined. Verbatim responses to Question A9 were reviewed for evidence of ineligibility. These generally consisted of cases in which the respondent had given a title such as research assistant, graduate assistant, lab assistant, or teaching or research fellow. If a questionable case showed any sign of eligibility (for example, providing responses to the question on classes taught or indicating faculty status) the respondent was assumed to be eligible. This review uncovered 23 respondents who were deemed to be ineligible and their questionnaire data were deleted.

The second, more automated, review was performed on cases in which the respondent answered "no" to Question 1 ("Did you have any instructional duties?") *and* Question 3 ("Did you have faculty status?"). All such records were examined, using additional data from the questionnaire to guide the determination of eligibility. As a result of this review, some additional respondents were deemed ineligible and their questionnaire data were deleted.

6.4.4 Institution Questionnaire Coding

Coding for the institution questionnaire was performed for verbatim definitions of full-time and part-time faculty, both instructional and non-instructional, and permanent and temporary faculty listed on page 2 of the questionnaire. The codeframe used to code institutional definitions of faculty was constructed based on responses from a sample of 100 questionnaires, selected to represent all institutional strata. Codes were then fine tuned for each individual category to include relevant variations and responses unique to each category.

Once the codeframe was created, a computer-assisted coding system was used to code the verbatim responses to faculty definitions for all completed institution questionnaires. Verbatim responses were data-entered into the system, and then coded on a case-by-case basis using the established codeframe. Responses to questionnaire items A1A-D and A2A-D (numbers of different types of staff employed during the 1992 Fall Term) and B15 and C31 (availability of benefits to temporary staff) appeared on-screen to assist in the interpretation of responses, particularly when a category was left blank.

Once all definitions were coded, a hardcopy printout of responses by category was reviewed for accuracy and consistency. Errors were marked on the printout and corrections were made to the file. After all corrections were made, the code file was merged with the institution questionnaire datafile.

Faculty codeframe. Most responses made reference to workload (number of hours worked, etc.) as part of the definition for full or part-time faculty. However, a response was coded as "defined by workload" only when no other factors were mentioned in the definition; other codes include "workload" as an implicit part of the definition.

Responses were coded as matching IPEDS definitions when the institution specifically said it used the IPEDS definition (or the glossary definition), or the response closely matched the glossary definition. If an institution mentioned additional factors not in the IPEDS/glossary definition, or if it was unclear that the definition matched IPEDS, it was coded in another appropriate category. Missing responses were coded as "not applicable" if answers to A1A-D, A2A-D, B15 or C31 clearly indicated that there were no faculty in a given category. The following are codes and definitions for each type of faculty/staff:

Full-time instructional faculty and staff:

1. defined by compensation or benefits (and teaching load)
2. defined by length or terms of contract (and teaching load)
3. defined by teaching load and/or other duties and responsibilities only (number of courses per term or year/number of hours or week/student contact hours/days worked per term or year)
4. defined by rank/title/faculty status/voting privileges or senate membership (and teaching load)
5. IPEDS/matching IPEDS definition
6. defined by funding source or type of funding/legislative body/other governing body (private or public) and teaching load
7. defined by tenure status—tenured or tenure track—and teaching load
8. other governmental or organizational definition used
9. other
10. not applicable/no faculty in this category

Full-time non-instructional faculty:

1. defined by compensation or benefits (and workload)
2. defined by length or terms of contract (and workload)
3. defined by workload and/or other duties and responsibilities only
4. defined by rank/title/faculty status/voting privileges or senate membership (and workload)
5. IPEDS/matching IPEDS definition
6. defined by funding source or type of funding/legislative body/other governing body (private or public) (and workload)
7. defined by tenure status (and workload)
8. other governmental or organizational definition used
9. other
10. not applicable/no faculty in this category

Part-time instructional faculty and staff:

1. defined by compensation or benefits (and teaching load)
2. defined by length or terms of contract (and teaching load)
3. defined by teaching load and/or other duties and responsibilities only (number of courses per term or year/number of hours or week/student contact hours/days worked per term or year)
4. defined by faculty status(including adjunct)/rank/title/level of privileges (and teaching load)
5. IPEDS/matching IPEDS
6. defined by funding source or type of funding/legislative body/other governing body (private or public) (and teaching load)
7. defined by tenure status (tenured/tenure track)
8. defined by lack of tenure status or ineligibility for tenure (and teaching load) (i.e., not tenured or tenure track)

9. other governmental or organizational definition used
10. defined by lack of faculty status or privileges
11. other
12. not applicable/no faculty in this category

Part-time non-instructional faculty:

1. defined by compensation or benefits (and workload)
2. defined by length or terms of contract (and workload)
3. defined by workload and/or types of duties and responsibilities only
4. defined by faculty status (incl. adjunct faculty)/rank/title/level of privileges (and workload)
5. defined by lack of faculty status (and workload)
6. IPEDS/matching IPEDS definition
7. defined by funding source or type of funding/legislative body/other governing body (private or public) (and workload)
8. defined by tenure status (and work load)
9. defined by lack of tenure status /ineligibility for tenure (and work load)
10. other governmental or organizational definition used
11. other
12. not applicable/no faculty in this category

Permanent faculty/instructional staff:

1. defined by compensation or benefits (and workload)
2. defined by length or terms of contract (and workload)
3. defined by teaching load and/or other duties and responsibilities only (number of courses per term or year/number of hours or week/student contact hours/days worked per term or year)
4. defined by rank/title/faculty status/voting privileges or senate membership (and workload)
5. IPEDS/matching IPEDS definition
6. defined by funding source or type of funding/legislative body/other governing body (private or public) (and workload)
7. defined by tenure status—tenured /tenure track (and workload)
8. defined by tenure status—tenured only
9. other governmental or organizational definition used
10. other
11. not applicable/no faculty in this category

Temporary faculty/instructional staff:

1. defined by compensation or benefits (and workload)
2. defined by length or terms of contract (and workload)
3. defined by work load and/or other duties and responsibilities only (number of courses per term or year/number of hours or week/student contact hours/days worked per term or year)
4. defined by faculty status (incl. visiting faculty)/rank/title /level of privileges
5. defined by lack of faculty status
6. IPEDS/matching IPEDS
7. defined by funding source or type of funding/legislative body/other governing body (private or public) (and workload)
8. defined as tenure track faculty only/faculty not yet tenured (but not ineligible for tenure)
9. defined as non-tenure track faculty only/not eligible for tenure
10. other governmental or organizational definition used
11. other
12. not applicable no faculty in this category

"Other specify" and verbatim text. In addition to the six questions from which the faculty codeframe was developed, six other institution questionnaire items were eligible for verbatim or "other specify" responses. Of these, only the answers to Questions B10C1 and C26C1, which asked for a description of "any other actions" taken to lower the percent of tenured faculty (for full-time instructional faculty and for full-time non-instructional faculty, respectively) provided consistent verbatim responses. For both Questions B10C1 and C26C1, the most frequently cited actions taken to reduce the percent of tenured faculty involved downsizing, redefining positions as non-tenured, and offering early retirement incentives. The complete listing of all "other specify" and verbatim responses is stored in electronic text form at NCES.

6.5 Scan Editing, Machine Editing, and Imputation

6.5.1 Faculty Questionnaire Editing and Imputation

Prior to data entry, editors scanned faculty questionnaires for readability, completeness, and overall adequacy. Problems (e.g., eligibility questions, incomplete questionnaires, etc.) were identified and forwarded to an edit/coding supervisor for resolution.

Range errors, logical inconsistencies, erroneous skip patterns, and any missing critical items were identified by a computer-based cleaning and editing system specifically developed for NSOPF–93. Whenever a case had one or more critical items missing, CADE operators were notified of the specific items that required retrieval and prompted to route the case to the telephone retrieval supervisor for follow-up. Moreover, the program identified out-of-range responses during data-entry and did not allow them to be keyed without confirmation that the response was accurately entered.

For erroneous skip patterns, values were logically assigned as feasible on the basis of the presence or absence of responses within the skip pattern, given the responses provided. For errors that could not be corrected in this fashion, the hardcopy questionnaire was inspected and if necessary, the respondent was called to try to resolve the problem. Questionnaires with missing critical items were forwarded to telephone interviewers for retrieval.

Range errors were examined and corrected through hardcopy examination, which involved reviewing a sample of cases with out-of-range responses in order to determine whether the responses were caused by something other than random variation or unique respondent situations. Following the examination, variables were treated in one of two ways. In some cases, the out-of-range response was topped off at the highest value encompassing 99.9 percent of the responses. There were no out-of-range values at the low end of the value range. As part of the cleaning and editing process, out-of-range values in a series or set of related items were "scaled" proportionally to an overall total.

On the fewer than 1 percent of the cases for which data on gender, race, and employment status of faculty were missing, the data were directly imputed whenever possible. This information had already been collected for most faculty on the sampling lists supplied by participating institutions. Additional editing and consistency checks were run to enforce ranges, skip pattern rules, and logical consistency among questionnaire items.

Because of the large amount of questionnaire data, a system of algorithms was developed to check and, if possible, to correct the validity of data elements. The principal rule was to preserve data collected from the questionnaires while correcting logical inconsistencies between related data elements. After cleaning, those data elements that remained missing were subsequently imputed.

Depending on the scale of the variable being imputed, one of two methods were used: 1) Regression imputation was used for continuous and dichotomous variables; and 2) Hotdeck imputation was used for unordered polytomous variables. The regression method incorporated in NCES's PROC IMPUTE was used to impute missing values for approximately 90 percent of the 395 items on the faculty questionnaire[23]. Of the total of 395 items, 353 were imputed using the regression-based imputation procedures only.

After a first round of imputation using PROC IMPUTE, the distributions and values of imputed items were compared to distributions and values for recorded items (i.e. non-missing data). These comparisons helped to pinpoint variables needing special treatment in order to produce credible imputed values. Special steps were taken to address particular problems arising during imputation. These were:

"Spikes" at zero values. A number of variables showed "spikes," where the same value was imputed to a number of cases within an imputation cell. To address the problem of spikes at the zero value, these variables were reimputed in two steps. First, a dummy variable to flag cases as containing a zero value or a value greater than zero was modeled. Second, only those cases which received the imputed dummy value greater than zero were modeled using the standard regression-based imputation procedures. This two-step process "smoothed out" the distribution of imputed values, eliminating the spikes at zero.

Illogical/implausible imputed values. The first round of regression-based imputation assigned values to items B20A and B20B (faculty productivity measures, i.e. books and articles published, presentations, patents, etc.). However, this imputation produced inappropriate imputations for particular types of faculty. For example, records of faculty members whose reported teaching and research fields had nothing to do with artistic performance were imputed to have performed artistic presentations. Likewise, faculty members whose reported areas of activity included teaching, but no research, were imputed to have performed research activities. In order to address these cases, another regression model including eight more predictors—in addition to the five "core predictors"—was specified for PROC IMPUTE to impute values for questionnaire sections whose items depended on proper specifications of teaching and research activities.

Imputing DKs. Two imputations were performed for selected items in the faculty questionnaire with "don't know" responses, where this caused 30 percent or more of the responses to be eligible for imputation. In the first imputation, "don't knows" were treated as legitimate responses. For these items, in the first imputation, missing responses were imputed across all response categories, including the "don't know" category. In the second imputation, "don't knows" were set to "missing" before imputation was performed. Two imputations were done to allow researchers to choose how to treat "don't knows" in their analyses. Two variables were used to signal these different approaches to imputation. The first, the survey variable, preserved "don't know" as a legitimate response. The second, identified by the letter "Y" preceding the variable name, includes imputation for "don't know" as well as "missing." The following faculty variables had two imputations performed:

---

[23] For a description of this technique, see American Institutes of Research, *Guidebook for Imputation of Missing Data* (August, 1980). AIR prepared this guidebook for the National Center for Education Statistics, under contract #300-78-150.

Survey variables	Imputed-DK variables	Variable description
D42	YD42	Age most likely to stop working at a postsecondary institution
D44	YD44	Draw on retirement and continue working at institution part-time
D45	YD45	Take early retirement option at institution
D46	YD46	Age most likely to retire from paid employment
F58A	YF58A	Mother's education
F58B	YF58B	Father's education
F60A-F60I	YF60A-YF60I	Opinion questions about institution, faculty and students

"Sequential nearest neighbor" hotdeck imputations were used on 42 items, the majority of them polytomous or categorical variables. Three items used both regression-based and hot deck imputations. To carry out the hotdeck imputations, the faculty file was first sorted by the following variables: ISTRATUM (institution sampling stratum), A4 (full-time/part-time stratus), OSGROUP (faculty oversampling stratum), F51 (faculty member gender), X01F52 (faculty member age) and a random number variable. Then the computer program proceeded sequentially through the sorted file, replacing each missing value by the last non-missing value.

All imputation was followed by a final series of cleaning passes that resulted in generally clean and logically consistent data. Some residual inconsistencies between different data elements remained in situations in which it was impossible to resolve the ambiguity as reported by the respondent.

6.5.2 Institution Questionnaire Editing and Imputation

Two manual edits were conducted for the institution questionnaire: the first checked for missing critical items, while the second, performed immediately prior to data entry, checked for filter questions that could be coded based on subsequent responses and responses that could be coded or corrected based on verbatims or documentation accompanying the questionnaire. Questionnaires were also reviewed for valid responses that did not fit into existing categories and for inter-item consistency.

As with the faculty questionnaire, a computer-based editing system was employed to check data for range errors, logical inconsistencies, and erroneous skip patterns. Any missing or inconsistent critical items were identified for retrieval. Hardcopy questionnaires were reviewed to resolve logical inconsistencies or skip pattern errors; out-of-range responses were reviewed to determine if they were legitimate. If necessary, the institutions were recontacted to try to resolve the problem.

After data entry was completed, institution data were run through additional consistency checks designed to flag data entry errors and inter-item inconsistencies; data entry errors were corrected based on a review of the hardcopy questionnaire; inter-item discrepancies that were clearly the result of systematic error were corrected through programmed cleaning statements.

Because the faculty counts (at Questions A1A-A1D, B2 and C20) and counts of tenure/tenure-track faculty (at Questions B6 and C22) that institutions provided were often estimated or provided by multiple offices (whose records may not match precisely), a small margin of error was allowed for inter-item discrepancies. Responses falling outside this range were individually reviewed and corrected, if possible, based on other questionnaire data. Discrepancies outside this margin of error were reviewed again, and, as appropriate, set to missing.

On the NSOPF-93 institution file, substantive responses were imputed for missing data using the regression method. "Don't know" responses were also imputed to distribute "don't know" across all response categories. Following imputation, a number of inter-item consistency checks and post-imputation cleaning procedures were implemented to produce logically consistent and valid data.

Imputed values at A2A-2F (counts for instructional faculty) and C20A-F (counts for non-instructional faculty) were corrected whenever possible by performing the math for non-imputed values to arrive at a contextually accurate amount. When multiple items were imputed, variables were corrected by using mean values to arrive at values proportionate to faculty totals. Errors in counts of tenured/tenure track faculty were similarly cleaned by using mean values to arrive at values proportionate to the total number of permanent faculty (at Question A2A) in the questionnaire. Those values replaced imputed values that caused the total number of tenured/tenure track faculty to be larger than the total number of temporary and permanent faculty reported at Question A1A.

A small number of discrepancies at Questions A2A-F and C20-F resulting from non-imputed data were allowed to stand. In these instances, discrepancies could not be corrected by using relevant questionnaire data. Hardcopy data for each case was reviewed to check for data-entry errors, or other problems indicating whether the value should be corrected or set to missing and imputed.

Answers at Question B17 (percent of undergraduate instruction carried out by full-time faculty) were cleaned so that the total of Questions B17 and D41 (percent of undergraduate instruction carried out by part-time faculty) was not greater than 100 percent. Responses totaling less or more than 100 percent were reviewed individually and cleaned on a case-by-case basis.

6.6 Retrieval of Missing Data

Appendices I and J contain lists of the items deemed critical for both survey questionnaires. If one or more of these items were missing, calls were made to retrieve the missing information. For the faculty questionnaire, out of the 20,785 self-administered instruments, approximately 5,705 (27 percent) were identified for retrieval. Retrieval was completed for 5,483 (96 percent) of these questionnaires. Of the 5,483 cases for which retrieval was completed, respondents provided some or all of the missing data required in approximately 84 percent of the cases. The remaining 16 percent of the 5,483 cases were determined to be complete without retrieval based on policy decisions reviewed with NCES. All faculty retrieval activities were completed by January 29, 1994.

Faculty self-administered questionnaires (SAQs) identified through the edit program as having missing data on critical items were forwarded to interviewers for additional follow-up. Case records were routed to a special location within CADE. Telephone retrievers were provided with the hardcopy SAQ, accompanied by a retrieval form listing items to be retrieved. The interviewer reviewed the hardcopy before calling to confirm that the case needed retrieval. "Don't knows" and "refusals" were considered legitimate responses for retrieval purposes and not followed up. Interviewers accessed contact information and updated case dispositions through the CATI system. New data were recorded directly on the hardcopy questionnaire and entered by data preparation staff.

For the institution questionnaires, 178 (20 percent) were identified for retrieval. Retrieval was completed for 172 (97 percent) of these cases. All institution retrieval activities were completed by June 8, 1994.

Retrievals for the institution questionnaire were identified largely through the two manual edits prior to data entry; again, "don't knows" and "refusals" were considered legitimate responses and not retrieved. Information was obtained both over the telephone and by fax. Once retrieval efforts for a case had been completed, the questionnaire was sent to data entry. If a retrieval was identified during the data entry process, the operator discontinued data entry on that case and routed it to a supervisor for review; if the information could not be obtained from existing documentation, the supervisor then forwarded the case to an interviewer for telephone retrieval.

6.7 Storage and Protection of Completed Instruments

Whenever questionnaires were not being processed, they were stored in a restricted area; access was limited to authorized project staff who had signed the NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure and had it notarized. The room was locked at night and protected by a surveillance system.

Data integrity was further ensured through a combination of electronic system access restrictions, screen update rules, and system maintenance and backup procedures that protected against unauthorized system access, mistakes in case information entry, and data loss. Every night all files used by the system were copied to tape and stored in a secure location. Information that identified individuals was maintained in physically separate files accessible only to authorized project staff.

Long-term storage of hardcopy documents is maintained in secure facilities with 24-hour surveillance, both at the contractor's Central Office and off-site, with access limited to authorized project staff who signed and had the NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure notarized.

7. Institution and Faculty Unit Response and Nonresponse

7.1 Institution Response Rates and Participation Rates

The NSOPF-93 institution sample consisted of 962 eligible institutions, 780 from the initial sample, and 182 from the supplemental sample. Each of the eligible institutions was sent a NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire and materials requesting faculty sampling lists. A total of 872 institutions completed the institution questionnaire, 702 in the initial sample and 170 in the supplemental sample. A total of 817 institutions submitted faculty sampling lists, 663 in the initial sample and 154 in the supplemental sample. Exhibit 7-1 illustrates these data.

Exhibit 7-1 shows the institution questionnaire response rates based on the number of eligible institutions. As previously noted, 12 institutions were found to be ineligible during data collection. Therefore, the number of eligible institutions is 962, reflecting the subtraction of 12 ineligible institutions from the 974 sampled institutions. The institution questionnaire response rate is calculated as the ratio of the number of completed institution-level questionnaires to the number of institutions in the sample, minus the number of ineligible institutions, or 872/(974 - 12) = 90.6 percent. The institution questionnaire response rates for the separate initial and supplemental samples were 90 percent and 93.4 percent, respectively. The participation rate, defined as the percentage of eligible institutions which provide faculty sampling lists, was an overall 84.9 percent. Participation rates for initial and supplemental samples differed only slightly. The participation rate for initial sample institutions was 85 percent, and the participation rate for supplemental institutions was 84.6 percent.

Exhibit 7-1: Institution questionnaire and faculty list response rates (unweighted) by sample component

Sample component	Eligible sample (1)	Completed institution questionnaire (2)	Submitted faculty sampling list (3)	Institution questionnaire response rate (2)/(1) (unweighted percent)	Participation rate (3)/(1) (unweighted percent)
Initial	780	702	663	90.0	85.0
Supplemental	182	170	154	93.4	84.6
Initial + supplemental	**962**	**872**	**817**	**90.6**	**84.9**

7.2 Characteristics of Institution Questionnaire Response and Nonresponse

Exhibit 7-2 displays the weighted response rates for the institution questionnaire and weighted participation rates by key sampling characteristics. When control (public/private) and level of offering (two-year/four-year) are considered, public four-year institutions (89.2 percent) had lower institution questionnaire response rates than other types of institutions. While the 100 percent response rate for private, two-year institutions is likely an artifact of the small number of cases, the response rate for the much larger sample of public two-year institutions was 94.0 percent. Private four-year institutions responded at a rate of 94.2 percent. Exhibit 7-2 also displays participation rates—a measure of the institution cooperation with the faculty survey, measured by the percentage of eligible institutions submitting faculty sampling lists. Public four-year institutions had the highest participation rate (88.2 percent), followed by public two-year (85.2 percent), private four-year (81.5 percent) and private two-year institutions (73.3 percent).

Exhibit 7-2: Institution questionnaire response rate and faculty list participation rate (weighted) by institution type and control

Level and control of institution	Eligible sample	Institution questionnaire response rate (weighted)		Faculty list participation rate (weighted)	
		Complete	Percent	Complete	Percent
Public four-year	331	292	89.2	295	88.2
Public two-year	333	314	94.0	273	85.2
Private four-year	284	252	94.2	238	81.5
Private two-year	14	14	100.0	11	73.3
Total	**962**	**872**	**93.6**	**817**	**83.4**

Exhibit 7-3 reports weighted institution questionnaire response rates and weighted faculty list participation rates for institutions grouped according to institution sampling strata. Institution questionnaire response rates ranged from a low of 80 percent, for public medical schools, to a high of 100 percent in four strata with comparatively small samples: private religious, private two-year, public other and private unknown institutions. For the three largest strata, response rates were 85.7 percent for the research/public other Ph.D. strata (where all institutions were selected with certainty), 89.9 percent for public comprehensive institutions, and 94 percent for public two-year institutions, respectively. Overall, the institution questionnaire response rate was 93.6 percent (weighted).

Institution participation rates generally fell short of institution questionnaire response rates. However, in the research/public other Ph.D. strata, the faculty list participation rate (90.5 percent) exceeded the response rate to the institution questionnaire (85.7 percent). In other words, the NSOPF-93 faculty sample was drawn from a higher proportion of eligible research/public other Ph.D. institutions than the proportion of research/public other Ph.D. institutions whose institution representatives responded to the institution survey. The lowest participation rates, ranging from 62.5 percent to 71.1 percent, occurred among institutions classified in the private two-year, the "other" (both public and private) and private "unknown" strata. The highest participation rates occurred among strata with small samples. Participation rates for the three largest strata, the research/public other Ph.D., public comprehensive, and public two-year strata were 90.5 percent, 88.5 percent and 84.8 percent, respectively.

Exhibit 7-3: Institution questionnaire response rate and faculty list participation rate (weighted) by institution sampling stratum

Institution stratum	Eligible sample	Institution questionnaire response rate (weighted)		Faculty list participation rate (weighted)	
		Complete	Percent	Complete	Percent
Private other Ph.D.	46	39	84.8	40	87.0
Public comprehensive	159	144	89.9	141	88.5
Private comprehensive	82	71	88.8	67	78.3
Public liberal arts	3	2	84.7	3	100.0
Private liberal arts	68	66	98.7	60	89.4
Public medical	25	20	80.0	21	84.1
Private medical	10	9	92.2	10	100.0
Private religious	18	18	100.0	14	77.1
Public two-year	316	298	94.0	258	84.8
Private two-year	10	10	100.0	8	71.1
Public other	7	7	100.0	6	62.5
Private other	24	19	83.2	15	68.3
Public unknown	19	18	94.5	17	92.8
Private unknown	7	7	100.0	5	67.4
Research/public other Ph.D.	168	144	85.7	152	90.5
Total	**962**	**872**	**93.6**	**817**	**83.4**

*Sampling stratum classification does not match the "level and control" classification (Exhibit 7-2) because institutions sampled in the "unknown" categories in NSOPF-93 were reclassified after data collection was complete.

7.3 Faculty Questionnaire Response Rates

Exhibit 7-4 compares the response rates for all NSOPF faculty surveys to date. Several points should be underscored in providing an appropriate context for comparing these results. First, the mode of data collection differed between the 1987-88 and 1992-93 cycles of NSOPF. The 1987 field test and 1988 full-scale study used a mail survey and relied on follow-up by mail and telephone. Institution Coordinators were responsible for distributing faculty questionnaires to their campus addresses. The 1992 field test and 1993 full-scale study used mail and interviewer-initiated telephone follow-up, and relied on Institution Coordinators only in instances when home addresses and telephone numbers for faculty were not provided on the faculty list and/or when the faculty response rate at an institution was low. Second, CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing) was used in the 1988 study at the end of the survey, and then only to complete 179 interviews, or 2.1 percent of the completed cases. In the 1993 full-scale study, CATI accounted for 19 percent of the completed cases. Third, the 1988 effort required more than six months to complete. The 1992 field test was completed in about four months. For the 1993 full-scale study, the first of six waves of questionnaire mailings occurred at the end of January, 1993; the last telephone interview was completed almost one year later.

Exhibit 7-4: Faculty response rates (unweighted) by NSOPF cycle

NSOPF cycle	Eligible sample	Number with completed questionnaires	Response rate (unweighted percent)
1987 Field test	235	160	68.1
1988 Main study	11,013	8,382	76.1
1992 Field test	605	495	81.8
1993 Main study	29,764	25,780	86.6

7.4 Faculty Eligibility

For NSOPF-93, faculty were considered eligible if they were: 1) a member of the part-time or full-time instructional staff, 2) designated as having faculty status even if they were involved in other full-time activities such as administration or research, or 3) had any instructional duties whether part-time or full-time, temporary or permanent. The individual's instructional and/or faculty status had to be effective as of October 15, 1992. Eligibility was determined based on information provided by the institution or by information provided in the faculty questionnaire. (See Chapter 3 for a detailed review of sampling eligibility criteria.)

After adjusting for 2,000 faculty subsampled out, 31,354 faculty remained in the sample. Of these, 1,590, or 5.1 percent, were declared ineligible. Of the ineligible faculty, 69 were deceased and 1,521 were otherwise ineligible. Sampled faculty were ruled ineligible if they fit any of the following descriptions: honorary faculty, military personnel who teach only ROTC courses; personnel who are supplied by an independent contractor; graduate assistants; faculty on unpaid leave, or who were not employed as teaching personnel or as faculty in the fall term that included October 15, 1992.

Exhibit 7-5 shows that self-administered questionnaires were completed for 20,785 of 25,780 respondents, or for 69.8 percent of the eligible sample. Computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI) were completed with 16.8 percent of the eligible sample. Among the specific reasons for faculty nonresponse, refusals (5.3 percent) accounted for the largest proportion, followed by locating problems (3.1 percent), and unavailable/not-at-home (1.1 percent). Two broad categories of nonrespondents are suggested by these results: refusals (5.3 percent), and other nonrespondents (8.1 percent). This suggests that the biggest nonresponse problem is the inability to contact the respondent.

Exhibit 7-5: Faculty response and nonresponse status

Final status	Total	Percent	
		Unweighted	Weighted
Sample (after subsampling)	31,354		
Ineligible (out-of-scope) (Deceased)	1,590 (69)		
Net sample (sample - ineligible)	**29,764**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Responding	**25,780**	**86.6**	**84.4**
Completed interviews —Self-administered questionnaires —CATI interviews	**25,780** 20,785 4,995	**86.6** 69.8 16.8	**84.4** 66.5 17.9
Non-responding —Refused —Unlocatable —Unavailable/not at home —Other	**3,984** 1,574 921 316 1,173	**13.4** 5.3 3.1 1.1 3.9	**15.6** 6.3 3.6 1.2 4.5

7.5 Summary: An Assessment of NSOPF-93 Faculty Response Rates

This section disaggregates faculty response rates in two ways: first, it explores if characteristics of faculty respondents' institutions affected response rates, and second, it explores whether individual/demographic characteristics of the faculty respondents affected response rates. Exhibits 7-6 to 7-7 also show the "overall response rates." For NSOPF-93 faculty members, the "overall response rate" is computed by multiplying the institution list participation rates by faculty level response rates. The weighted overall response rate for the faculty survey is 70.4, or the product of the survey's weighted list participation rate and the weighted overall faculty response rate (83.4 percent × 84.4 percent = 70.4 percent). In other words, NSOPF-93 achieved a response rate of 70.4 percent for the estimated universe of all eligible faculty and instructional staff in U.S. higher education institutions.

Exhibit 7-6 presents weighted response rates disaggregated by two institutional characteristics: by level/control, a category that combines both level of offering and control, and by institution sampling strata. As the exhibit shows, weighted faculty questionnaire response rates were nearly identical for public institutions. However, there was wide variation for private institutions. Private two-year institution faculty responded at a rate of 91.8 percent (with a 67.3 percent overall response rate), compared with 81.2 percent (66.2 percent overall response rate) for private four-year institution faculty. Faculty at private medical and private "other" institutions (including a wide array of professional and specialized degree-granting institutions) responded to the faculty questionnaire at the lowest rates (67.9 percent and 64.3 percent, respectively) of all faculty.

Exhibit 7-6 indicates that NSOPF-93 achieved above average overall response rates among institutions in the largest strata (research/other Ph.D., public comprehensive, and public two-year strata), where the majority of postsecondary faculty are found. The lowest overall response rates were among institutions which account for small numbers of postsecondary faculty (public and private "other" institutions and private "unknown" institutions). Yet, with the exception of faculty in the private "other" stratum, which showed the lowest overall response rate (43.8 percent), faculty questionnaire response rates exceeded 85 percent in these strata.

Therefore, the low institution faculty list participation rates explained the low overall response rates in the public "other" and private "unknown" strata.

Exhibit 7-7 indicates how specific individual-level characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, academic discipline, and employment status) affected weighted response rates. In interpreting these data, two points should be kept in mind. First, categorization of individual faculty members depended on information each participating institution provided on the faculty sampling lists. These lists' validity is discussed in Chapter 9. Second, overall faculty response rates are calculated by multiplying the overall weighted institution faculty list participation rate (83.4 percent) by weighted response rates for each faculty-level category. Therefore, no adjustment to overall faculty response rates is made for institution-level variables such as institutional level and control or institutional sampling strata.

Sampled female faculty were slightly more likely to respond to the questionnaire than sampled male faculty. White, non-Hispanics showed the highest response rates among the racial and ethnic groups: 86.7 percent of white, non-Hispanic faculty members surveyed responded to the questionnaire, followed by Asian/Pacific Islanders (85.5 percent), Hispanics (84.5 percent), black, non-Hispanics (83.9 percent) and American Indian/Alaskan Natives (70.2 percent).

Academic disciplines were divided between non-National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) disciplines and four NEH disciplines: philosophy/religion, foreign languages, English language and literature, and history. Sampled faculty in the NEH disciplines responded to the survey at a slightly higher rate than faculty in the non-NEH disciplines (85.1 percent, compared to 84.7 percent, weighted data). Therefore, the response rate for faculty in the four NEH disciplines slightly exceeded the response rate for all faculty in the sample. Faculty in the history discipline responded at 88.2 percent, nearly four percentage points higher than the average response rate for all faculty. Foreign language faculty responded at a lower-than average rate of 81.8 percent, 2.6 percentage points less than the average response rate for all faculty. Finally, sampled full-time faculty were more likely to respond to the questionnaire than part-time faculty.

As the exhibit also points out, respondents whose gender, race/ethnicity, and discipline were unknown showed the lowest response rates among each of those subgroups. Respondents whose employment status was unknown responded at about the same rate as part-time faculty. Overall response rates followed the patterns set in faculty questionnaire response rates. All categories of faculty attained a 70 percent or higher overall response rate except faculty members whose individual characteristics were unknown, American Indian/Alaskan Natives, foreign language faculty, and part-time faculty.

Exhibit 7-6: Faculty questionnaire and overall response rates by institutional characteristics

Institutional characteristic	Faculty list participation rate (weighted percent) (1)	Faculty Eligible	Faculty Complete	Faculty questionnaire response rate (weighted percent) (2)	Overall response rate (weighted percent) (1) × (2)
Institutional level/control					
Public four-year	88.2	11,029	9,682	85.7	75.6
Public two-year	85.2	9,913	8,646	85.6	72.9
Private four-year	81.5	8,483	7,146	81.2	66.2
Private two-year	73.3	339	306	91.8	67.3
Institutional sampling stratum					
Private other Ph.D.	87.0	1,422	1,141	79.6	69.2
Public comprehensive	88.5	5,308	4,718	87.2	77.2
Private comprehensive	78.3	2,510	2,191	85.6	67.0
Public liberal arts	100.0	90	87	96.0	96.0
Private liberal arts	89.4	2,281	2,067	89.5	80.0
Public medical	84.1	764	633	78.0	65.7
Private medical	100.0	321	236	67.9	67.9
Private religious	77.1	291	244	83.0	63.9
Public two-year	84.8	9,382	8,187	85.6	72.6
Private two-year	71.1	268	248	92.6	65.8
Public other	62.5	219	188	87.0	54.4
Private other	68.3	509	367	64.3	43.8
Public unknown	92.8	597	509	85.0	78.9
Private unknown	67.4	136	114	85.1	57.3
Research/public other Ph.D.	90.5	5,666	4,850	83.1	75.2
Total respondents	**83.4**	**29,764**	**25,780**	**84.4**	**70.4**

•Sampling stratum classification does not match the "level and control" classification because institutions sampled in the "unknown" categories in NSOPF-93 were reclassified after data collection was complete.

Exhibit 7-7: Faculty response rates by individual characteristics

Individual characteristic, identified on faculty list	Subgroup	Eligible	Completed	Faculty questionnaire response rate (weighted percent)	Overall faculty response rate (weighted percent)
Gender	Unknown	1,857	1,416	76.0	63.4
	Male	15,879	13,720	84.0	70.1
	Female	12,028	10,644	87.0	72.6
Race/ethnicity	Unknown	7,967	6,507	79.1	66.0
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	96	78	70.2	58.6
	Asian/Pacific Islander	1,132	993	85.5	71.4
	Hispanic	1,199	1,033	84.5	70.5
	Black, non-Hispanic	2,458	2,097	83.9	70.0
	White, non-Hispanic	16,912	15,072	86.7	72.4
Discipline	Unknown	1,647	1,316	79.9	66.6
	Non-NEH	23,256	20,248	84.7	70.7
	History	904	804	88.2	73.6
	Foreign language	995	829	81.8	68.2
	English	2,379	2,069	85.1	71.0
	Philosophy/religion	583	514	85.7	71.6
Employment	Unknown	3,380	2,824	82.6	68.9
	Full-time	17,596	15,618	86.6	72.2
	Part-time	8,788	7,338	81.6	68.1
Total respondents		**29,764**	**25,780**	**84.4**	**70.4**

8. Questionnaire Item Nonresponse

Item nonresponse may create two impediments to the successful analysis of survey data. Item nonresponse may bias survey data if the values of the missing data differ from those of the known data. Item nonresponse can also diminish the number of observations that can be used in calculating statistics from affected data elements and can thus increase sampling variances. Since item nonresponse is an important source of potential bias, it is necessary to measure its extent so that analysts can properly take potential response biases into account when developing their analysis plans. This chapter reviews the item nonresponse rates for NSOPF-93 for both the faculty and institution questionnaires.

8.1 Item Nonresponse: Definition and Considerations

Item nonresponse occurs when a respondent fails to complete certain items on a survey instrument. While bias associated with unit nonresponse has been controlled by adjusting case weights, item nonresponse has generally been addressed with imputation in the NSOPF-93 faculty and institution datasets. Machine editing rectified nonresponse problems for some items by imposing inter-item consistency, particularly by forcing logical agreement between filter and dependent questions. For example, the missing response to a filter question can often be inferred if dependent questions have been answered. Because the edited files were used in the nonresponse analysis reported below, this adjustment to item nonresponse is reflected in the results of the analysis.

Note that unit nonresponse is a further source of missing item data—nonparticipating sample members complete no questionnaire items. Weights adjust for nonresponse by projecting questionnaire data to the full population, with appropriate adjustments for defined subgroups. However, nonresponse-adjusted weights cannot compensate for the bias that arises if nonrespondents and respondents would have answered the questionnaire differently. Hence "total response" to a specific item could actually be thought of as the overall survey (unit) response rate multiplied by the item response rate.

Two main objectives guide the following item nonresponse analysis. One objective is to quantify mean questionnaire nonresponse overall as well as nonresponse for the faculty and institution samples on key variables. A second objective is to describe nonresponse patterns in terms of item characteristics. In order to realize the first objective, nonresponse rates were calculated for each survey item, and average rates of nonresponse were calculated for each instrument. To fulfill the second objective, nonresponse was measured as a function of two item characteristics: position in the questionnaire and topic. The characteristics of questions with item nonresponse rates greater than or equal to 10 percent were further examined. For the faculty questionnaire, the effect of questionnaire administration mode—self-administered versus interviewer-administered (telephone and in-person)—on item nonresponse was also analyzed.

The item nonresponse rate is defined as the ratio of the total number of nonresponses among eligible respondents to the number of respondents eligible to respond to a questionnaire item. In the notation of the exhibits listing nonresponse rates, the item nonresponse rate, RATE, equals the number of item nonresponses divided by the number of eligible unit respondents ("n"). The standard error of the item nonresponse rate, STDERR, equals the square root of RATE × (1 - RATE)/n. In general, the larger the n, (i.e., the greater the number of eligible unit respondents for a particular item), and the further the RATE is from .5, the lower the STDERR. The standard errors assume simple random sampling. For a question composed of multiple subparts, each subpart eliciting a distinct response is counted as an item for item nonresponse purposes.

For the NSOPF-93 questionnaires, several reserve codes were used to categorize nonresponse on preliminary data files prior to imputation. The reserve code definitions were as follows:

> **Refused.** Respondent was unwilling to answer the question at the time of the questionnaire administration and upon nonresponse follow-up by survey administrators.
>
> **Don't know.** In the NSOPF-93 datasets, "don't know" is embedded as a legitimate response category in some questionnaire items. For purposes of this analysis, "don't know" was categorized as "missing."
>
> **Missing.** The response is illegitimately missing. That is, a response that should be present for this respondent is missing.
>
> **Multiple answers.** Respondent illegitimately chose more than one response.
>
> **Legitimate skip.** The response is legitimately missing. That is, owing either to responses to preceding filter questions or to other respondent characteristics, data for this item should not be present for this respondent. Such responses have been excluded from this nonresponse analysis; they were excluded from both numerator and denominator. [However, when "not applicable" (NA) is provided as a legitimate response category of an item, it is treated as an item response. When the "not applicable" response is circled, it is included in the denominator, but not the numerator, of the item nonresponse rate formula.]

All means reported in the following analysis are unweighted. The unweighted means ignore variability among items in the number of eligible unit respondents.

8.2 Faculty Questionnaire Item Nonresponse

Faculty questionnaires were administered to 25,780 respondents. The faculty questionnaire consisted of six sections and 395 items, which required approximately 45 minutes to complete. Exhibits 8-1 through 8-3, show descriptive statistics for item nonresponse for the faculty questionnaires overall and for items grouped into categories depending upon position in the questionnaire and topic addressed. The mean item nonresponse rate was .103 for the faculty questionnaires.

8.2.1 Nonresponse by Item Placement, Item Topic, and Administration Mode

Nonresponse by questionnaire position. Exhibit 8-1 indicates that nonresponse in the middle third of the questionnaire contributed the greatest portion to the overall nonresponse rate. The first third of the questionnaire had a mean item nonresponse rate of .029, the middle third showed a mean item nonresponse rate of .155, and the last third of the questionnaire produced a mean item nonresponse rate of .066. This nonresponse pattern differs from the pattern that would be expected if respondent fatigue accounted for the bulk of questionnaire item nonresponse. Typically, item nonresponse due to respondent fatigue increases monotonically from the beginning to the end of the questionnaire.

Exhibit 8-1: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire by thirds (unweighted data)

Questionnaire by thirds	Mean	STDERR
First third: Questions 1-20	0.029	0.002
Middle third: Questions 21-40	0.155	0.013
Last third: Questions 41-60	0.066	0.004
Entire questionnaire	0.103	0.007

A closer look at the questionnaire items reveals that Questions C32 and C33, asking respondents to detail the grants and contracts they administered or received in the 1992 fall term, account for the bulk of the nonresponse. More than three-quarters of respondents did not answer Question C32, which asked them to provide the number of individuals *other than the respondent* supported by grants and contracts for which the respondent was principal or co-principal investigator. Nonresponse on Question C33, which included 54 subparts, ranged from 12.4 percent to 74 percent.

These high rates of nonresponse appear to stem from two factors. First, the number of eligible respondents to these questions ranged from 1,176 to 13,935. Second, the questions asked respondents to list the precise number and dollar amounts of grants and contracts they administered. Because of the detail involved in answering these questions accurately, most respondents would presumably have had to consult their records. Presented with this time-consuming research task, many respondents eligible to answer the questions may have skipped them instead. The combination of these factors greatly increased nonresponse rates on these specific items. For example, the number of eligible faculty who administered state or local government grants or contracts (Questions C33B4 to C33E4_3) was 1,176. Faculty classified as nonrespondents to these questions ranged from 534 to 547, for a nonresponse rate that varied between .457 and .465.

Questions C35A1-C35A6 also contributed to the higher item nonresponse in the middle third of the questionnaire. "Don't know" was provided in the questionnaire as a response choice for these items, treated as missing for this analysis. The imputation flags in Appendix P show the range of "don't knows" for these items.

The .066 mean item nonresponse rate for the last third of the questionnaire is affected by "don't know" responses to items D42, D44, D45, D46, F58, and F60, which ranged from 25 to over 30 percent. Imputation treated these items in two ways discussed in Chapter 6. One imputation treatment preserved "don't know" as a valid response, since "don't know" was a response category for each of these items, though treated as missing in this item nonresponse analysis.

Item nonresponse by topic. The NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaires are organized topically. Each section represents a different theme, as Exhibit 8-2 shows. Average item nonresponse rates and standard errors for each instrument and section are presented in the exhibit as well.

Exhibit 8-2: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire by topic (unweighted data)

Questionnaire content area	Section and questions	Mean	STDERR
Employment	Section A: Questions 1-13	.046	.005
Professional background	Section B: Questions 14-20	.025	.001
Institutional responsibilities and workload	Section C: Questions 21-37	.160	.014
Job satisfaction	Section D: Questions 38-46	.072	.008
Compensation	Section E: Questions 47-50	.091	.004
Sociodemographic characteristics	Section F: Questions 51-60	.051	.006

Section C, "Institutional Responsibilities and Workload," returned the highest mean item nonresponse rate (.16). Section C's high rate appears to stem from the impact of Questions C32 and C33, discussed above. This figure is 1.76 times greater than for section E, "Compensation," which shows the next largest mean item nonresponse rate at .091. The lowest rate (.025), appeared in section B, "Professional Background." The mean rate was .046 for section A, "Employment," followed by .051 for section F, "Sociodemographic Conditions," and by .072 for section D on "Job Satisfaction."

Nonresponse by critical items. Since a complete edit with data retrieval for *all* missing items would be prohibitively expensive for most surveys, the conventional strategy is to identify a subset of "key" or "critical" items for each survey instrument, which, if not answered, triggers an attempt to recontact the respondents to obtain the missing data. See Appendix I for a list of all critical items on the faculty questionnaire.

Exhibit 8-3 displays the mean critical and noncritical item nonresponse rates for the faculty questionnaires. Nonresponse on critical items ranged from almost none (.0003 percent on Question_1, the screener determining if the respondent performed instructional duties) to 8.5 percent (on Question F57C, listing the country of citizenship for non-U.S. citizens). In contrast, the mean item nonresponse rate for noncritical items amounted to .112, about six times the critical item nonresponse rate.

Exhibit 8-3: Mean item nonresponse rates for critical items on the faculty questionnaire (unweighted data)

Item type	Mean	STDERR
Critical	0.019	0.003
Noncritical	0.112	0.008

The item nonresponse rate for each of the critical items in the faculty questionnaires is shown in Appendix I.

Nonresponse by questionnaire administration mode. The faculty questionnaire was administered in two ways: self-administered questionnaire and telephone interview. In total, 20,785 respondents completed self-administered questionnaires. Another 4,995 respondents completed the questionnaire by telephone interview.

More than 600 of the telephone interviews were completed on the abbreviated questionnaire exhibited in Appendix H. Since the majority of questions were not asked in the abbreviated questionnaire, many items on these questionnaires contributed to item nonresponse.

The mean item nonresponse rate on self-administered surveys differed little from the mean rate item on interviewer-administered surveys, as is illustrated in Exhibit 8-4. In fact, the mean rate of nonresponse showed remarkable consistency across survey modes. The mean nonresponse rate for self-administered surveys (.102) closely matched the mean rate for interviewer assisted surveys (.100).

Exhibit 8-4: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire, by questionnaire third and mode (unweighted data)

Questionnaire section by thirds	Self-administered		Interviewer-administered		All modes	
	Mean	STDERR	Mean	STDERR	Mean	STDERR
First third: Questions 1-20	.028	.001	.035	.004	.029	.002
Middle third: Questions 21-40	.158	.014	.14	.011	.155	.013
Last third: Questions 41-60	.061	.004	.086	.007	.066	.004
Entire questionnaire	.102	.008	.100	.006	.103	.007

There is no clear association of mean nonresponse with the method of survey administration. Interviewer-administered surveys produced a lower mean nonresponse than self-administered questionnaires in the questionnaire's middle third, but self-administered surveys produced lower mean nonresponse in the first and final thirds. Nevertheless, as Exhibit 8-4 shows, the differences in mean nonresponse between survey modes are slight.

When viewed by questionnaire section, however, self-administered surveys produce a lower mean nonresponse rate on four of six sections. Particularly noticeable is the difference on the demographic characteristics section of the questionnaire, shown in Exhibit 8-5. The mean item nonresponse rate for interviewer-administered surveys is almost three times the rate for self-administered questionnaires. For the job satisfaction questions, the mean item nonresponse rate for interviewer-administered surveys is almost twice the rate for self-administered questionnaires. These differences may reflect respondent reluctance to disclose demographic details and/or specific attitudes and opinions in an interview setting.

Because four-fifths of the respondents used self-administered questionnaires, the level of nonresponse for the entire survey more closely mirrored the rates of nonresponse obtained on self-administered questionnaires. Patterns of item nonresponse in both completion modes are similar. On both self-administered and interviewer-administered questionnaires, levels of nonresponse were lowest in the first two sections and last sections of the questionnaire. This pattern suggests that fatigue was not as significant a factor in determining nonresponse as were the requirements necessary to answer the questions authoritatively. Again, section C on "Institutional Responsibilities and Workload," which involved answering many detailed questions, produced the highest level of nonresponse in both survey modes.

Exhibit 8-5: Mean item nonresponse rates for faculty questionnaire by section and mode (unweighted data)

Section	Section content	Questions	Self-administered		Interviewer-administered		All modes	
			Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
A	Employment	Questions 1-13	.040	.004	.067	.013	.046	.005
B	Professional background	Questions 14-20	.024	.001	.026	.003	.025	.001
C	Institutional responsibilities and workload	Questions 21-37	.163	.014	.138	.012	.160	.014
D	Job satisfaction	Questions 38-46	.064	.008	.105	.014	.072	.008
E	Compensation	Questions 47-50	.094	.005	.077	.005	.091	.005
F	Demographic characteristics	Questions 51-58	.038	.005	.105	.015	.051	.006

8.2.2 Items with High Item Nonresponse

For purposes of this analysis, high item nonresponse was deemed to be nonresponse greater than or equal to 10 percent; given the high rate of unit response in the study, this 10 percent threshold for identifying items displaying high nonresponse is relatively conservative. Appendix I displays questions, number of eligible respondents, nonresponse rates, and standard errors for faculty questionnaire items with nonresponse greater than or equal to 10 percent.

As discussed earlier, the question whose subparts showed the highest level of nonresponse was Question C33, with most of its subparts displaying item nonresponse levels of more than 20 percent. Question C25, requesting numbers of students receiving individual instruction from the respondent and an estimate of time per week spent with them, shows a consistent pattern of nonresponse of around 20 to 22 percent for each of the question's two parts. This suggests that nonresponse may be interpreted largely as an indication that these respondents did not engage in individualized instruction with students.

8.3 Institution Questionnaire Item Nonresponse

Institution respondents completed 872 institution-level questionnaires. Each questionnaire included 283 items. Anecdotal evidence suggests that completion of the institution questionnaire required several hours of university staff time, sometimes spread over several weeks, and at times, spread over several months. On average, completion of the questionnaire involved input from more than one institution respondent. Exhibit 8-6 displays questionnaire sections and descriptive statistics for item nonresponse for the institution-level questionnaires. Since 89 percent of the institution questionnaires were self-administered, no breakdown of nonresponse by mode of questionnaire administration is presented. The NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire, like the faculty questionnaire, is organized topically; each section of the questionnaire represents a different theme. Exhibit 8-7 lists the instrument's sections by thirds of the questionnaire, and provides question number ranges for each section.

Exhibit 8-6: Mean item nonresponse rates for institution questionnaire by content area (unweighted data)

Questionnaire content area	Section and questions	Mean	STDERR
Preface	Section A: Questions AC1-A1C	.074	.023
Full-time instructional	Section B: Questions 2-19	.053	.004
Full-time non-instructional	Section C: Questions 20-33	.127	.011
Part-time instructional	Section D: Questions 34-43	.147	.015
Total		.101	.006

8.3.1 Item Nonresponse by Questionnaire Position and Topic

The mean item nonresponse rate for the institution questionnaire was .101, with item nonresponse levels increasing in the latter stages of the questionnaire. Analysis showed the questionnaire's first third produced the lowest mean item nonresponse rate (.051), as shown in Exhibit 8-7, with the mean item nonresponse rate increasing to .081 in the questionnaire's middle third, and to .161 in the questionnaire's last third. The mean item nonresponse rate also increased as the subject matter moved from questions pertaining to full-time instructional staff (.053) in section B to questions pertaining to part-time instructional staff (.147) in section D as shown in Exhibit 8-6. This pattern suggests two possible explanations: first, institutions may have had a more difficult time supplying information on part-time staff; or second, respondent fatigue.

Exhibit 8-7: Mean item nonresponse rates for institution questionnaire by questionnaire third (unweighted data)

Questionnaire section by thirds	Mean	STDERR
First third: Preface-Question 14	.051	.006
Middle third: Questions 15-29	.081	.006
Last third: Questions 30-43	.161	.013
Entire questionnaire	.101	.006

Institution survey item nonresponse by critical items. Exhibit 8-8 displays mean critical and noncritical item nonresponse rates for the institution questionnaires. The mean item nonresponse rate for the 15 critical items is .036, compared to a rate of .104 for noncritical items. Critical items are listed in Appendix J.

Exhibit 8-8: Mean item nonresponse rates for critical items on the institution questionnaire (unweighted data)

Item type	Mean	STDERR
Critical	.036	0.01
Noncritical	.104	0.01

Nonresponse on individual critical items ranges from none to 7.3 percent across the institution questionnaires. As in critical items on the faculty questionnaire, "don't know" was not offered as a legitimate response category in the critical item questions. Moreover, because of their access to institutional information, most respondents (college or university administrators) possessed greater ability to provide the information the critical items solicited. The item nonresponse rate for each of the critical items in the institution questionnaires is shown in Appendix J.

8.3.2 Items with High Item Nonresponse

For purposes of this analysis, high item nonresponse was deemed to be nonresponse equal to or greater than 10 percent; given the high rate of unit response in the study, this 10 percent threshold for identifying items displaying high nonresponse is relatively conservative. Use of a more liberal threshold, such as 20 percent, yields a considerably smaller number of problematic questionnaire items.

Appendix J displays the number of eligible respondents, nonresponse rates, and standard errors for institution questionnaire items with nonresponse greater than or equal to 10 percent.

Questions C27, C32, C33, D35, D37 and D40—all of them soliciting information on the range of benefits for part-time, non-instructional, and temporary employees—showed rates of item nonresponse greater than 20 percent. Low eligible sample sizes (in some cases, with $n < 100$) characterized these items, suggesting that only a small number of institutions offered the full range of benefits for either type of faculty. To take an example, item D40C2 reports an item nonresponse rate of 53 percent. However, this rate is based on a ratio of 93 nonrespondents to only 174 eligible respondents. This low n of eligible respondents stems from, first, the fact that only 493 of the 872 responding institutions offer benefits to part-time faculty; and second, that only 375 institutions have specific requirements for part-time instructional faculty to receive benefits. Other filters in the questionnaire lowered the number of eligible respondents to 174.

Item nonresponse appears to be high for this set of questions for two reasons: first, the questions dealt with subsets of faculty (i.e. full-time non-instructional, part-time and temporary employees) about whom it may have been difficult to provide information; second, these questions were positioned later in the questionnaire; and third, the questionnaire consisted of almost 300 questions and subquestions. These explanations for high item nonresponse could have reinforced each other.

Perhaps the most extreme illustration of the first explanation can be observed at Question C32, where respondents were asked to provide information about "temporary, full-time, non-instructional faculty." The difficulty of specifying answers for this group (as opposed to, say, full-time non-instructional faculty or full-time faculty) may have contributed to high item nonresponse.

The institution questionnaire had the potential of requiring more than 120 individual entries by the end of Section B; an additional 100 entries by the end of Section C; and yet another 67 entries by the end of Section D. For the benefits questions (B15, B16, C31, C32, D35, D37, D40) and the assessment of teaching performance questions (B18 and D42), "don't know" was pre-printed as a response for many of the sub-items. In 1988, benefits questions were asked only about full-time instructional faculty in the institution questionnaire, and the assessment questions were asked only in the department questionnaire. In the 1992 field test, no questions were asked about temporary faculty. As a result, "don't know" was provided as a response category for benefits questions for temporary full-time faculty and instructional staff, and for part-time instructional faculty/staff, and for the performance assessment questions.

Appendix P contains the imputation flags for all missing items, with separate flags for "don't know" responses that were set to missing before imputation. For B15 and B16 (benefits for temporary full-time instructional faculty/staff) six respondents did not answer either B15 or any sub-items at B16A-O; the "don't know" responses ranged from 20 to 30 for B15, and for the 15 sub-items of B16. Out of 872 respondents to the questionnaire, 584 were eligible to answer B16.

For C31 and C32 (benefits for temporary full-time non-instructional faculty), and at C35-C37 (benefits for part-time instructional faculty and staff) more respondents did not answer at all, rather than select a "don't know" response. At this point, respondents may have found it burdensome to select a response for each sub-item.

In the benefits questions, sub-items that asked whether a particular benefit was fully subsidized, partially subsidized or not subsidized at all, appeared to be difficult to answer as well. These sub-items were added after the field test for the majority of the benefits questions. "Don't know was not provided as a response choice, and several sub-items had nonresponse rates greater than 10 percent, with sub-items such as subsidization of housing, and cafeteria-style benefits plans having higher nonresponse rates even for full-time permanent instructional faculty/staff. For other faculty groups, the nonresponse rates were higher for more of these sub-items. This again is likely to indicate respondents did not know the answers.

"Don't know" responses were offered as a response choice at the sub-items of Questions B18 and B22 (methods used to assess teaching performance). There were fewer "don't knows" than unanswered for these sub-items, but the total number of missings suggests that these questions may not be easily answered at the institution level.

9. Faculty Questionnaire Data Quality

This chapter reviews the results of a validity and reliability evaluation of faculty questionnaire items. For purposes of NSOPF-93, "validity" is defined as the correlation or association between the measured and true values of a characteristic or attribute. "Reliability" expresses the correlation or association between repeated measurements of the same item.[24] The goals of the validity and reliability evaluations are to identify faculty questionnaire items that yield data of low quality and to identify characteristics of items (question wording, context, and unclear or ambiguous response categories) that cause response problems. The NSOPF-93 field test used different research designs to evaluate the validity and reliability of faculty questionnaire items. Validity was also evaluated for the full-scale study.

9.1 Validity and Reliability in the NSOPF-93 Field Test

To evaluate validity in the NSOPF-93 field test, faculty responses to selected items of the faculty questionnaire were compared with data obtained from the postsecondary institution in which the faculty member was employed during the fall of 1991 for the field test. Each sampled institution was requested to provide data on the gender, race/ethnicity, employment status (full-time versus part-time), principal field or teaching discipline, and tenure status (tenured versus not tenured) of sample faculty at their institution (Tenure status was used only in the field test). These institutional data were used to evaluate faculty members' self-reports of the same characteristics.

To evaluate reliability for the field test, a subsample of faculty who responded to the original interview were reinterviewed. The reinterview was conducted via telephone, while all field test faculty were asked, initially, to complete a self-administered questionnaire. A small number of respondents who failed to complete a self-administered interview completed a computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI). The reinterview questionnaire (see Appendix D) included a subset of the same items that were administered in the original interview, including items on instructional duties, principal activities, field or discipline, degrees and honors, previous jobs, publications and presentations, funded research, allocation of time, and salary. These items were selected in part because they were identified to be potentially problematic for respondents. The reliability of each reinterview item was evaluated by comparing faculty members' responses to the reinterview with their responses to the original interview. The sample size for the reliability evaluation was 117 cases.

The conclusions of the field test validity evaluation were as follows:

- For gender, race/ethnicity, and employment status, the faculty questionnaire and institutional data were consistent in more than 90 percent of the sample cases.
- For principal discipline or field, the percentage of consistent cases for the field test was slightly below 70 percent.

---

[24] See Robert M. Groves, *Survey Errors and Survey Costs* (New York: John Wiley, 1989), pp. 19, 22. The terms validity and reliability are variously defined in the scientific literature. For other definitions, see Edward G. Carmines and Richard A. Zeller, *Reliability and Validity Assessment* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979); and Judith T. Lessler and William D. Kalsbeek, *Nonsampling Error in Surveys* (New York: John Wiley, 1992), pp. 238-239.

- Inconsistencies between the institutional and questionnaire data do not necessarily point to low validity of the questionnaire data. This is true for several reasons: errors are possible in both data sources; the questions that were posed to faculty and to institutions were not exactly identical; and high rates of missing data, especially missing institutional data, vitiate several of the comparisons. In particular, and as might be expected, institutions reported principal discipline as "unknown" much more frequently than do faculty.

The conclusions of the field test reliability evaluation are as follows:

- For each of eight categorical variables that were evaluated, that is, instructional duties (Question 1), credit or noncredit courses (Question 1[A]), principal activity (Question 2), principal field (Question 14), last degree (Question 18), level of students in classes (Question 23), and funded research (Question 29), the interview and reinterview responses are consistent in more than 70 percent of the cases. Given the high standard errors associated with a sample of 117 cases, we do not have evidence of poor reliability.

- Most of 19 continuous variables that were evaluated have correlations greater than .70 between the original and reinterview responses. The interview-reinterview correlations are low for the following variables:

Hours per week—unpaid activities (Question 37[C]):	r = .31.
Percentage of hours—professional growth (Question 38[E-F]):	r = .13.
Percentage of hours—research (Question 38[G-J]):	r = .29.
Percentage of hours—other activities (Question 38[K-P]):	r = .47.
Income from outside consulting (Question 51[H]):	r = .40.

- Low associations or correlations between interview and reinterview responses do not necessarily indicate poor reliability of the self-administered questionnaire (SAQ), because the reinterview was conducted by telephone rather than by SAQ. It is plausible that some of the characteristics were measured more reliably by SAQ than by telephone. The different questionnaire contexts of the items in the interview and reinterview may be an additional cause of discrepancies, since the reinterview asked only a subset of the original items. Finally, the small sample size and high rates of missing data also attenuate some of the conclusions based on the reliability evaluation.

A more detailed description of validity and reliability tests performed during the field test is available in the *1992-92 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Field Test Report* [NCES 93-390].

9.2 Changes to the 1993 Full Scale Study

The low reliability noted on a number of items in Question 38 on the field test faculty questionnaire resulted in a decision to revise this question for the full-scale study. This question, asking respondents to document the percentage of their time they spent performing 16 different job-related and non-teaching activities, was revised to reduce to six the number of job-related and non-teaching activities.

For purposes of cost-saving and efficiency, only five faculty discipline codes were recorded on the electronic faculty list. These were the National Endowment for the Humanities-designated disciplines (philosophy/religion, foreign languages, English language and literature, and history) and one "non-NEH" category. Data were coded in this form because the NSOPF-93 oversampled four specific humanities departments. The validity tests discussed in the following section take this change in the faculty list into account.

9.3 Validity in the 1993 Full Scale Study

The sample size for the field test validity study was 495 cases. The full-scale study validity sample sizes varied from 19,273 pairs of cases (on the comparison of racial/ethnic data) to 24,362 pairs of cases (for the comparison of faculty gender). Data obtained from the NSOPF-93 instrument and data supplied by institutions were compared on four respondent characteristics: gender, race/ethnicity, employment status (full-time or part-time) and academic discipline. Exhibits 9-1 to 9-4 summarize the direct comparisons of faculty list data with faculty questionnaire data. Exhibit 9-5 compares these data and assesses the consistency in responses between faculty list and questionnaire data. Measures of association (chi square, Cramer's V) and measures of inconsistency (percent inconsistent and the index of inconsistency) were used. All statistical tests of validity indicated that the data obtained from the NSOPF-93 instrument provided valid measures of respondent gender, race/ethnicity, employment status and academic discipline.

The inconsistency index is defined as "the ratio of [simple response variance] to the total variance of the [characteristic being measured], where 'total variance' includes the variability in the population of the characteristic being measured."[25] The index of inconsistency gives a more accurate reading of data quality than the percent inconsistent, because it adjusts for the prevalence of an attribute in the population. The index is standardized by adjusting for marginal distributions of responses in the two datasets (institution-provided and NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire data). It is more accurately comparable across different items allowing generalizations about levels of inconsistency observed. Index values of .20 or lower are considered to represent low inconsistency, values between .20 and .50 are considered moderate, and values of .50 and higher are considered to represent high levels of inconsistency.

Exhibits 9-1 to 9-4 report comparisons on four faculty characteristics: gender, full-time/part-time status, discipline and race/ethnicity. In each table, the row variable is the faculty list variable and the column variable is the faculty questionnaire variable. In general, each exhibit shows a high degree of correspondence between faculty list and faculty questionnaire data. The measures of association reported in the tables are generally high (greater than .70)—even for multiple-cell comparisons (e.g., race/ethnicity).

The consistency noted between the faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data equal or exceed the consistency of faculty list and faculty questionnaire data noted in the *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Field Test Report* [NCES 93-390]. For example, faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data for employment status (full-time/ part-time) diverged only in 5.7 percent of the cases in the NSOPF-93 full-scale study, compared to a 8.2 percent of the cases that were inconsistent in the field test data. On the race/ethnicity comparison, faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data results were almost identical, showing agreement between the faculty list and the faculty questionnaire 96.1 percent of the time in the full-scale study compared to 96.6 percent in the field test.

The faculty sampling list showed great accuracy in accounting for the employment status of sampled faculty, with 94.3 percent of faculty self-reports of status matching their institutions' reports. Of the 5.7 percent of cases that did not match, 870 faculty whose institutions identified them as part-timers classified themselves as full-timers. In contrast, 437 faculty whose institutions identified them as full-timers classified themselves as part-timers.

Nevertheless, Exhibit 9-2 illustrates higher reporting variability with regard to part-time faculty. Institutions and full-time faculty agreed on their classification of employment status 97.2 percent of the time. In comparison, institutions and part-time faculty agreed on their classification of employment status 88.1 percent of the time.

---

[25] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Evaluating Censuses of Population and Housing* (Washington, D.C., 1985), p. 70.

Although the consistency between faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data is generally high for other variables, a few anomalies can be noted in other tables. For example, 32.4 percent of faculty whose institutions classified them in the "philosophy/religion" disciplines placed themselves in the "non-NEH" fields (Exhibit 9-3). It is possible that faculty members whom institutions identify as teaching in religion departments do not hold religion degrees (e.g. sociologists teaching "Sociology of Religion" courses). These faculty members may have listed their teaching discipline as something other than "religion/religious studies."

Exhibit 9-1: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by gender

	Gender (NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire) (percent of cases)		
Gender (faculty list)	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**
Male	13,475 (98.2)	244 (1.8)	13,719 (56.3)
Female	200 (1.9)	10,443 (98.1)	10,643 (43.7)
Total	13,675 (56.1)	10,687 (43.9)	24,362 (100.0)

Effective Sample Size: 24,362
Frequency Missing: 1,418

Statistic	**DF**	**Value**	**Prob.**
Chi-Square	1	22591.762	.001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	28969.580	.001

Phi Coefficient	.963
Contingency Coefficient	.694
Cramers' V	.963

Exhibit 9-2: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by full-time/part-time status (percent of cases)

	Status (NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire)		
Status (faculty list)	**Full-time**	**Part-time**	**Total**
Full-time	15,181 (97.2)	437 (2.8)	15,618 (68.0)
Part-time	870 (11.9)	6,468 (88.1)	7,338 (32.0)
Total	16,051 (69.9)	6,905 (30.1)	22,956 (100.0)

Effective Sample Size: 22,956
Frequency Missing: 2,824

Statistic	**DF**	**Value**	**Prob.**
Chi-Square	1	17290.137	.001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	1	18746.712	.001

Phi Coefficient	.868
Contingency Coefficient	.655
Cramers' V	.868

Exhibit 9-3: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by faculty discipline

	Discipline (NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire) (percent of cases)					
Discipline (faculty list)	**Non-NEH**	**History**	**Foreign language**	**English**	**Philosophy/ religion**	**Total**
Non-NEH	18,581 (95.1)	122 (0.6)	128 (0.7)	631 (3.2)	78 (0.4)	19,540 (82.4)
History	136 (17.2)	638 (80.5)	2 (0.3)	11 (1.4)	6 (0.8)	793 (3.3)
Foreign languages	57 (7.0)	6 (0.7)	684 (83.7)	65 (8.0)	5 (0.6)	817 (3.4)
English	167 (8.1)	7 (0.3)	40 (1.9)	1,839 (89.4)	4 (0.2)	2,057 (8.7)
Philosophy/ Religion	166 (32.4)	13 (2.5)	1 (0.2)	5 (1.0)	327 (63.9)	512 (2.2)
Total	19,107 (80.6)	786 (3.3)	855 (3.6)	2,551 (10.8)	420 (1.8)	23,719 (100.0)

Effective Sample Size: 23,719
Frequency Missing: 2,061

Statistic	**DF**	**Value**	**Prob.**
Chi-Square	16	57131.212	.001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	16	20039.422	.001

Phi Coefficient	1.552
Contingency Coefficient	.841
Cramers' V	.776

Exhibit 9-4: Comparison of faculty list data and faculty questionnaire data, by race/ethnicity

	Race/Ethnicity (NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire) (percent of cases)					
Race/ethnicity (faculty list)	**White, non-Hispanic**	**Black, non-Hispanic**	**Hispanic**	**Asian/ Pacific Islander**	**American Indian/ Alaskan Native**	**Total**
White, non-Hispanic	14,769 (98.0)	63 (0.4)	110 (0.7)	73 (0.5)	57 (0.4)	15,072 (78.2)
Black, non-Hispanic	102 (4.9)	1,947 (92.9)	23 (1.1)	19 (0.9)	6 (0.3)	2,097 (10.9)
Hispanic	85 (8.2)	3 (0.3)	892 (86.4)	36 (3.5)	17 (1.7)	1,033 (5.4)
Asian/Pacific Islander	79 (8.0)	8 (0.8)	10 (1.0)	890 (89.6)	6 (0.6)	993 (5.2)
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	38 (48.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	9 (11.5)	30 (38.5)	78 (0.4)
Total	15,073 (78.2)	2,021 (10.5)	1,036 (5.4)	1,027 (5.3)	116 (0.6)	19,273 (100.0)

Effective Sample Size: 19,273
Frequency Missing: 6,507

Statistic	**DF**	**Value**	**Prob.**
Chi-Square	16	47902.600	.001
Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square	16	22554.377	.001

Phi Coefficient	1.577
Contingency Coefficient	.844
Cramers' V	.788

The comparison between institution-supplied data and respondent answers on the instrument showed a very high level of consistency. The question ascertaining faculty academic discipline (Question A12) produced the highest level of inconsistency, with about 7 percent of answers failing to match information on institutional records. However, this represented a nearly five-fold improvement in consistency noted on a similar question in the *1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Field Test Report* [NCES 93-390]. The lowest level of inconsistency was observed on questions regarding race/ethnicity and gender.

As noted in Exhibit 9-5, the inconsistency index roughly paralleled the patterns observed in the percent inconsistent measure. Inconsistency was lowest on sociodemographic questions (race/ethnicity and gender) and highest on employment-related questions (employment status and discipline). The discipline question showed the highest level of inconsistency (21.4 percent), when measured on this index. This compared to the 6.96 percent figure obtained in the raw percent inconsistent measure, in which faculty discipline also exhibited the highest level of inconsistency. The percentage of consistent cases for principal discipline or field increased from 69.5 percent on the field test to 93 percent on the full-scale study.

Exhibit 9-5: Comparison of faculty and institution data, NSOPF-93: various measures

Item	Base *n*	Cramer's V	Percent inconsistent	Inconsistency index (standard error)**
Gender	24,362	.963*	1.82	3.70 (.176)
Race/ethnicity	19,273	.788*	3.39	10.41 (.374)
Employment	22,956	.868*	5.69	13.31 (.368)
Discipline	23,719	.776*	6.96	21.4 (.510)

*Significant at .001.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

9.4 An Assessment of Validity for the 1993 Full Scale Study

A look at the cross-tabular distributions of the institution-provided and respondent-provided data suggest the sources of inconsistency (Exhibits 9-1 to 9-4).

Gender. Only a small number of cases, 1.8 percent of the total, showed inconsistency between institution and respondent. This level of inconsistency is probably to be expected from such factors as clerical error or chance.

Race/ethnicity. The greatest source of inconsistency resulted from respondents, identified by their institutions as white, non-Hispanic, identifying themselves as Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, or American Indian/Alaskan Native. Fully 49 percent of self-identified American Indian/Alaskan Natives were classified by their institutions as white, non-Hispanic. However, since these cases of inconsistency total only 1.2 percent of cases in the sample, they have little impact on the overall levels of inconsistency noted in Exhibit 9-5.

Employment Status. Slightly more than 6 percent (6.3 percent) of faculty members who identified themselves as part-time on the survey instruments were classified as full-time faculty by their institution. Likewise, 5.4 percent of institution-classified part-time staff gave their employment status as "full time."

Discipline. The majority of inconsistencies arose when respondents listed their disciplines as one of the four National Endowment for the Humanities-designated disciplines (philosophy/religion, foreign languages, English language and literature, and history) while their institutions listed their disciplines as "non-NEH." Almost one-quarter (24.7 percent) of self-identified English faculty were classified by their institutions as "non-NEH." The comparable figures for other disciplines were as follows: philosophy/religion (18.6 percent), history (15.5 percent), foreign languages (15.0 percent).

All indices reviewed here exhibit much lower levels of inconsistency in the institution-respondent comparison than were observed in the field test report. The much larger sample size for the full-scale study decreased the impact of the small number of inconsistent responses. Moreover, on one comparison (faculty discipline), available data allowed for a comparison on five, rather than 14, discipline choices. Therefore, the decreased inconsistency in the discipline comparison may simply reflect decreased variability in responses due to the decision to restrict the number of disciplines recorded.

9.5 Data Quality and Faculty Population Estimates

Preliminary investigations using the original NSOPF-93 faculty data file produced national faculty population estimates that did not match expectations. As Chapter 10 and Appendix R explain in detail, a recontacting and reconciliation effort was performed to check the accuracy of estimates of the national population of faculty derived from original faculty lists. This reconciliation procedure helped to create "best estimates" of faculty counts at participating NSOPF-93 institutions. The best estimates were then used to establish national population estimates of full-time and part-time faculty.

The two-step process of compiling the original faculty list and confirming "best estimates" in the recontact and reconciliation effort can be likened to a test-retest exercise used in standard reliability studies. Moreover, the establishment through the recontacting effort of the "true value" for the count of faculty at each institution aided in judging the validity of the original faculty list. Exhibit 9-6 presents four statistics for establishing the validity and reliability of the original list. Statistics are presented for all participating institutions in the NSOPF-93 sample and for the subset of reconciled institutions.

To calculate the inconsistency measures (percent inconsistent and aggregate index of inconsistency), which usually apply to categorical data, a four-level scale for the best estimates dataset was created by partitioning the unweighted best estimates for total faculty (a continuous variable) into quartiles. The original list data was then recoded into a similar four-level scale, using the same cutpoints used to partition the best estimates data. This procedure allowed the use of inconsistency measures to validate the original faculty list against the "true values" the best estimates represent. As Exhibit 9-6 illustrates, the original faculty list showed a moderate level of inconsistency compared to the "true" values. However, even this moderate level introduced a divergence from true values and, thus, inaccuracy into estimates of faculty population. Data gathered during the reconciliation effort were used to poststratify national population estimates to the "true" values. Chapter 10 explains reconciliation procedures and post-stratification.

Exhibit 9-6: Measures of reliability and validity (unweighted data)

	Reconciled institutions (*n*=492)	Total institutions (*n*=817)
Mean original LIST (standard error)	771.1 (44.1)	659.1(28.9)
Mean BEST estimate (standard error)	802.7 (42.0)	678.3 (27.8)
Percent inconsistent* (standard error)	26.4 (2.0)	18.4 (1.4)
Index of inconsistency* (standard error)	35.2 (2.7)	24.5 (1.8)

*Based on comparison of institutions assigned to quartiles.

10. Institution Recontact, Best Estimates, and Post-Stratification

10.1 Accuracy of National Population Estimates

In the spring and summer of 1995, exploratory analysis using the NSOPF-93 faculty dataset produced faculty estimates that diverged, in some cases significantly, from expectations. Gaps appeared between faculty counts reported on the faculty list (or sampling frame) and faculty counts that institution administrators reported in the institution questionnaire. Discrepancies were also apparent in the estimates of faculty in the health sciences—though they appeared across other faculty disciplines as well—and in estimates of part-time faculty. Statistical and anecdotal evidence on higher education for the period in question (1987 to 1992) predicted an increase, rather than a decrease, in part-time faculty. Results from the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire supported this expectation, as Exhibit 10-1 shows. But, as Exhibit 10-1 also demonstrates, weighted national estimates of faculty teaching for-credit courses derived from the original NSOPF-93 faculty dataset showed no change in the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty from the NSOPF-88 faculty dataset. The NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire estimated that part-time instructional faculty and staff accounted for 9 percent more of the total number of instructional faculty in the U.S. than did estimates derived from the original NSOPF-93 faculty dataset. The NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire also estimated that part-time instructional faculty accounted for nearly 5 percent more of the total number of instructional faculty in the U.S. in the fall of 1992 than the NSOPF-88 institution questionnaire reported for the fall of 1987.

Exhibit 10-1: Estimates of total, full-time and part-time faculty teaching for-credit courses from four NSOPF sources (weighted)

	NSOPF-88				**NSOPF-93**			
	Institution questionnaire		**Faculty questionnaire**		**Institution questionnaire**		**Original faculty questionnaire**	
	Total	**Pct.**	**Total**	**Pct.**	**Total**	**Pct.**	**Total**	**Pct.**
Total faculty	824,685	100	769,825	100	940,192	100	712,858	100
Full-time faculty	513,663	62.3	515,138	66.9	539,210	57.6	474,788	66.6
Part-time faculty	311,022	37.7	254,687	33.1	400,981	42.4	238,070	33.4

Sources: NSOPF-93 Restricted-use Faculty Data, 1988 and 1993 (1995); Preliminary Delivery of Restricted-use NSOPF-93 Faculty Data File (October 14, 1996); NSOPF-88 Institution Dataset

In the health sciences, estimates of the total number of faculty showed a decline of approximately 48,000 from estimates produced for NSOPF-88, as presented in Exhibit 10-2. A check with the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and other health sciences professional organizations cast doubt on the accuracy of the NSOPF-93 data. Their data suggested that health sciences faculties had not declined sharply. While the AAMC definitions of faculty do not match NSOPF definitions exactly, the 1994 *AAMC Data Book* reported that paid faculty (both full-time and part-time) in pre-clinical and clinical sciences in U.S. medical schools increased from 75,156 in 1987-88 to 94,641 in 1992-93.[26]

NSOPF-88 estimated a population of health sciences faculty nearly 54,000 greater than the 1987-88 AAMC estimate. But NSOPF-93 estimated a population of health sciences faculty nearly 14,000 less than the 1992-93 AAMC estimate. In the 1987-88 to 1992-93 period, the NSOPF estimate of the health sciences faculty population declined, while the AAMC estimate of faculty in pre-clinical and clinical sciences increased.

These observations may have indicated a problem in the NSOPF-88 dataset. The difficulty of obtaining and rechecking sampling and weighting datafiles prepared for the 1987 survey forestalled further exploration of that dataset. While the possibility of a problem in NSOPF-88 cannot be ruled out, the fact that the estimates showed a substantial *decline* in 1992-93 health sciences faculty that was unsupported by external sources suggested it was more prudent to begin the investigation with the later cycle of NSOPF.

This chapter discusses the extent of discrepancies in faculty counts in NSOPF-93 and summarizes the procedures used to reconcile discrepancies to calculate "best estimates" of full-time, part-time, and total faculty in the NSOPF-93 faculty dataset.

Exhibit 10-2: Changes in health sciences faculty between NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93 (weighted)

Principal Fields	**NSOPF-88 faculty dataset**			**NSOPF-93 original faculty dataset**		
	Total #	**Pct. full-time**	**Pct. part-time**	**Total #**	**Pct. full-time**	**Pct. part-time**
Health technology	8,904	56.6	43.4	10,101	64.2	35.8
Dentistry	9,403	46.0	54.0	5,684	57.9	42.1
Health svc. admin.	1,295	61.8	38.2	1,137	49.9	50.1
Medicine/psychiatry	52,865	83.4	16.6	19,136	80.3	19.7
Nursing	25,902	74.7	26.3	25,573	77.0	23.0
Pharmacy	3,958	72.4	27.6	2,215	78.3	21.7
Public health	7,301	63.7	36.3	2,554	77.3	22.7
Veterinary medicine	2,816	97.9	2.1	1,994	85.2	14.8
Other health sciences	16,567	61.1	38.9	12,522	68.9	31.1
ALL HEALTH SCIENCES	129,011	72.7	27.3	80,916	73.5	26.5

---

[26] Table C1, "Number of Full-Time, Part-Time, and Volunteer Faculty in U.S. Medical Schools," *AAMC Data Book* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Medical Colleges, 1994). The AAMC data report faculty in U.S. medical schools. NSOPF tracks health sciences faculty at postsecondary institutions, whether or not they work in medical schools.

10.2 Discrepancies in Faculty Counts[27]

Estimates of the total number of faculty in the target population were based on reports from two different sources within the same sampled institutions. One of these sources was the faculty lists provided by the participating institutions for sampling purposes (hereafter, referred to as "LIST"). Another source was the institutional representatives' survey responses to the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire (hereafter, referred to as "QUEX") regarding the number of faculty in these same institutions. A third source of validation, the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (hereafter referred to as "IPEDS"[28]), provided a benchmark by which to check faculty estimates from the other two sources. The study intended to enumerate eligible faculty employed in the academic term including October 15, 1992.

Discrepancies in faculty estimates from the three sources (LIST, QUEX, and IPEDS) were to some extent inevitable because of variations in definitions used by IPEDS and the two NSOPF-93 sources. NSOPF-93 used a broader and more inclusive definition of postsecondary faculty than IPEDS uses. See the discussion on comparisons between NSOPF and IPEDS in section 3.10 and in Appendix R, section 1.2. Moreover, postsecondary institutions use different data systems to account for faculty. To check the quality of the faculty lists during the 1992 list collection effort, discrepancies between the numbers of total faculty enumerated among these three sources were monitored. This institution-level comparison of unweighted data found that faculty counts from the LIST and QUEX data generally exceeded those reported on IPEDS. This pattern was in the anticipated direction, indicating that the original listing operation accounted for a greater number of faculty than institutions reported in the 1991-92 IPEDS (the most current data available when the study was fielded). Exhibit 10-3 summarizes the total number of faculty enumerated on these datasets.

---

[27] The analysis presented here concentrates on the discrepancy in faculty counts between those reported on the faculty list provided for sampling purposes and those reported on the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire. For a more detailed discussion of the discrepancy analysis and of the recontacting effort, see Appendix R: *Technical Report: Discrepancies in Faculty Estimates in the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty.*

[28] The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) coordinates with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to obtain biennial data (such as race, gender, salary levels, job classifications, etc.) from postsecondary institutions on their employees. NCES publishes these data in its Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Exhibit 10-3: NSOPF counts of total faculty (unweighted) by source and year

(LIST-IPEDS) Comparison	**Faculty Counts (Matched Observations*)**	
	NSOPF-88	**NSOPF-93**
LIST	232,618 (*n*=410)	490,935 (*n*=718)
IPEDS	231,376 (*n*=410)	419,903 (*n*=718)
(QUEX-LIST) Comparison		
QUEX	236,121 (*n*=410)	495,235 (*n*=760)
LIST	232,618 (*n*=410)	477,692 (*n*=760)
(QUEX-IPEDS) Comparison		
QUEX	236,121 (*n*=410)	484,611 (*n*=746)
IPEDS	231,376 (*n*=410)	405,636 (*n*=746)

* The numbers under the faculty counts represent the number of "matched" institutions, i.e. institutions which provided data from both sources. For example, in the NSOPF-93 QUEX/IPEDS comparison, 746 institutions had both QUEX and IPEDS data available for comparison.

Later comparisons[29] of QUEX counts with both IPEDS and LIST counts revealed that the QUEX counts consistently exceeded those reported on the other two sources. This analysis concentrates on the QUEX/LIST comparison, because the definitions of faculty used for both sources were identical. A comparison of faculty lists and institution questionnaires should indicate whether institutions accounted for the same faculty populations on their faculty lists and on their institution questionnaires.

Faculty lists furnished counts for total faculty, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty. The institution questionnaire reported separate counts of each of four types of faculty in the institution: full-time instructional faculty, full-time non-instructional faculty, part-time instructional faculty, and part-time non-instructional faculty. For the discrepancy analysis, institution questionnaire (i.e., QUEX) counts for full-time and part-time faculty were derived by adding together instructional and non-instructional faculty for each type of employment status (i.e., full-time, part-time). Then total faculty counts were derived by adding together QUEX counts for full-time and part-time faculty.

The analysis identified institutions with QUEX/LIST discrepancies of 10 percent or more in their total faculty counts by calculating the percentage discrepancy between LIST totals and QUEX totals [specifically, 100(QUEX-LIST)/LIST] for each institution. Negative discrepancies signified that LIST counts exceeded

---

[29] Because data collection for the institution questionnaire began after the first faculty lists were received and concluded after the last faculty list was received, discrepancies between these two sources of faculty counts (i.e., discrepancies between QUEX and LIST) could not be assessed during the faculty list collection process. Moreover, fewer than one-half of the individuals named as respondents to the institution questionnaire were the same individuals who oversaw preparation of faculty sampling lists.

QUEX counts. Positive discrepancies signified the opposite, that is, that QUEX counts exceeded LIST counts. A total of 450 of 760 institutions (or 59 percent) for which total faculty data for *both* QUEX and LIST were available (i.e., "matched observations") had discrepancies of 10 percent or more.

To identify systematic sources of discrepancies in faculty counts between questionnaire data and faculty lists, a number of institutional characteristics were considered. These were: size (smaller or larger number of faculty members than the median), control (public or private), type (two-year versus four-year), and stratum. Exhibit 10-4 presents paired t-tests in faculty estimates for small and large institutions, for public and private institutions and for two-year and four-year institutions. Exhibit 10-5 presents the results of paired t-tests for institutions in different sampling strata. If there is no difference between QUEX and LIST (i.e., the null hypothesis), the institution's discrepancy is equal to zero. These t-tests indicate whether the mean difference between faculty counts provided on the institution questionnaire and the number of faculty enumerated on the faculty list are significantly different from zero.

Institution size. Institutions were divided into "small" and "large" at the median LIST count of 363 faculty members. The analysis found significant differences between small and large institutions in the QUEX/LIST comparison. Smaller institutions tended to provide higher faculty counts on the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire than they did on the faculty list. Conversely, larger institutions tended to provide lower faculty estimates on the institution questionnaire than they did on the faculty list. On average, smaller institutions reported 68 more faculty members on their institution questionnaires than on their sampling lists. This difference was the only one which met a significance level of p=.05. The observation that larger institutions tended to report 23 fewer faculty members on their institution questionnaires than on their lists, was not statistically significant.

Control. The direction of the sign for the mean difference suggests that private institutions tended to account for larger numbers of faculty members on their sampling lists than did public institutions. However, the public/private control dimension was not a statistically significant predictor of the magnitude of differences between LIST and QUEX.

Type. Discrepancies for four-year institutions were negligible, with the mean faculty counts from the institution questionnaire exceeding those on the faculty lists by only 1.8 percent (calculation of mean percent differences are not shown). For the two-year institutions in the sample, however, the mean discrepancy of 40.9 indicated that two-year institutions reported a greater number of faculty members on their questionnaires than on their lists, perhaps reflecting their greater reliance on a more transient population of temporary and part-time faculty. Still, the mean difference for two-year institutions was not significant at the .05 level.

Exhibit 10-4: Discrepancies by institution characteristics: size, type and control mean differences (matched pairs t-tests), fall 1992

Comparison	**Institution questionnaire—faculty list (QUEX - LIST)**		
Institution characteristic	***n***	**Mean difference (standard error)****	**Probability**
Size			
Small	382	68.3 (12.1)*	.00
Large	378	-22.6 (31.3)	.47
Control			
Public	529	38.2 (22.4)	.08
Private	231	-11.5 (20.7)	.58
Type			
Two-year	267	40.9 (23.2)	.08
Four-year	493	13.4 (22.7)	.55

*Significant at .05.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

NOTE: "Large" and "small" institutions are divided at the median faculty count of 363 faculty members in the LIST count.

Sampling Stratum. Paired t-tests were conducted on institutions classified into the 15 sampling strata described in Chapter 3. Public two-year institutions stood out. Discrepancies calculated for these institutions (a mean discrepancy of 45.7 for public two-year institutions) came closest to registering a significant difference.

Exhibit 10-5: Discrepancies by sampling stratum mean differences (matched pairs t-tests), fall 1992

Sampling stratum	**Institution questionnaire - faculty list (QUEX - LIST)**		
	n	**Mean difference (standard error)***	**Probability**
Private, other Ph.D.	37	11.3 (48.4)	.82
Public comprehensive	131	17.0 (24.7)	.49
Private comprehensive	62	35.2 (28.3)	.22
Public liberal arts	2	968.5 (968.5)	.5
Private liberal arts	58	-8.3 (5.4)	.13
Public medical	18	11.5 (249.8)	.96
Private medical	9	-454.9 (354.9)	.24
Private religious	14	-4.5 (5.7)	.45
Public two-year	248	45.7 (24.9)	.07
Private two-year	8	16 (13.8)	.29
Public other	6	85.7 (80.4)	.34
Private other	12	53.3 (51.3)	.32
Public unknown	17	-16.0 (32.3)	.63
Private unknown	5	94.6 (104.5)	.42
Research/public, other Ph.D.	133	-17.9 (64.5)	.78
TOTAL	760	23.1 (16.8)	.17

*Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

These observations provide some evidence for the hypothesis that some institutions' faculty lists, specifically those of smaller and two-year institutions, do not account for all the faculty members reported on the institution questionnaire. There may be several reasons for this phenomenon. Smaller institutions are more likely to rely on part-time faculty—who are less likely to be accounted for on institution records—than larger institutions. Public two-year institutions employ the highest number of part-time faculty of all types of institutions in the NSOPF-93 sample. Almost one-half (48 percent) of all part-time instructional faculty and staff work for public two-year institutions, according to the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education* [NCES 97-080]. Smaller institutions are also less likely than large institutions to have sophisticated personnel databases or institutional research offices. These characteristics of smaller and two-year institutions could account for the fact that these institutions listed fewer faculty on their sampling lists than they reported on their institution questionnaire.

Exhibit 10-6 profiles the 760 matched institutions and the 100 institutions that possessed the largest discrepancies (expressed in percentage terms). The exhibit illustrates the significance of smaller, two-year institutions in contributing to the problem of discrepancies noted above. While public two-year institutions represent about one-third of the 760 matched institutions, they represent slightly less than one-half of the institutions (46 percent) with the largest discrepancies. Nearly nine of 10 institutions with the greatest discrepancies listed fewer faculty members on their faculty lists than on their institution questionnaires. In comparison, 55.5 percent of matched institutions showed a similar pattern.

While this analysis suggests that some institutional variables are associated with significant discrepancies (particularly size), most were found not to be significant at $\alpha=.05$ level. Yet the mean differences reported in Exhibits 10-4 and 10-5 can understate the impact of discrepancies on the institution level. The large standard errors reported in the tables indicate the wide variation in discrepancies at the institution level. Institution-level discrepancies expressed in percentage terms ranged from -86.2 percent to 1,827.4 percent. Validity studies of item-level response on surveys have noted that "Because of the possibility of compensating errors in the data, an acceptable aggregate-level comparison is not necessarily associated with high individual-level accuracy."[30]

Exhibit 10-6: A comparison of matched institutions and the 100 institutions with the largest discrepancies (unweighted frequencies)

Characteristic	**Matched institutions (*n*=760) (percent)**	**Largest discrepancies (*n*=100) (percent)**
Sampling stratum		
Private, other Ph.D.	4.9	6.0
Public comprehensive	17.2	9.0
Private comprehensive	8.2	11.0
Public liberal arts	.3	1.0
Private liberal arts	7.6	0.0
Public medical	2.4	5.0
Private medical	1.2	2.0
Private religious	1.8	2.0
Public two-year	32.6	46.0
Private two-year	1.1	2.0
Public other	.8	1.0
Private other	1.6	3.0
Public unknown	2.2	3.0
Private unknown	.7	1.0
Research/public, other Ph.D.	17.5	8.0
Size		
Small (Less than 363 faculty)	50.3	70.0
Large (363 faculty or more)	49.7	30.0
LIST/QUEX comparison		
LIST > QUEX	42.1	11.0
QUEX = LIST	2.4	0.0
QUEX > LIST	55.5	89.0

---

[30] E.J. Wentland and K.W. Smith, *Survey Responses: An Evaluation of Their Validity* (San Diego: Academic Press, Inc., 1993), pp. 124-125.

10.3 Obtaining Verification from Institutions

To determine which faculty counts more accurately reflected institutions' "true" population estimates, a large subset of institutions were recontacted. Institutions that showed a difference of 10 percent or greater between their QUEX faculty totals and their LIST faculty totals were selected. As mentioned earlier, 450 of the 760 "matched" institutions[31] (59 percent) showed a discrepancy of 10 percent or more between the institution questionnaire and the faculty list. Moreover, to document institutions' accounting for their health sciences faculty, all 120 institutions which NCES identified as operating medical schools or hospitals were also included in the recontacting effort. Of those 120 institutions, 61 were already included among the 450 institutions with discrepancies of 10 percent or greater.

The objective in recontact was to determine which set of faculty counts was correct (QUEX, LIST or, in some instances, a third set of counts), and to determine the reasons for the original reporting discrepancies. In telephone follow-up calls, institution administrators were presented with QUEX and LIST figures and asked to choose which of the two most accurately reflected the true population estimate of their faculty in the fall term of 1992. In most cases, administrators were able to choose either the QUEX or the LIST figure. However, in some cases, administrators supplied a different set of estimates.

Of the total of 509 institutions selected for recontact, verification was obtained for 492 (or 96.7 percent) of the institutions. A total of 402 (81.7 percent) of the institutions reported, at a minimum, which set of counts—those from the faculty sampling list or those from the institution questionnaire—provided the most accurate faculty estimates. In 280 of the 492 (56.9 percent) cases, institutions reported that the institution questionnaire data provided the most accurate faculty estimates.

One hundred twenty-two (24.8 percent) institutions reported that the faculty list they supplied for sampling purposes (i.e., LIST) provided the most accurate accounting of their faculty and instructional staff population. Only 56 of the 492 institutions (11.4 percent) provided an entirely different set of estimates that did not correspond either to the list or to the questionnaire estimates originally submitted. Five institutions (1 percent)—all institutions operating medical schools or hospitals—chose IPEDS as their best estimate. The remaining 29 institutions (5.9 percent) were unable to provide a definitive rationale for changing their original LIST estimates. For these, the original LIST estimate was used to derive best estimates. Exhibit 10-7 illustrates the results of the recontacting effort for the 492 institutions providing verified data.

---

[31] Although 817 institutions provided faculty enumerations in the NSOPF-93 full-scale study, only 760 (93 percent) of this total had matched data available (i.e., also completed an institution questionnaire).

Exhibit 10-7: Sources for verified estimates from reconciliation effort, fall 1992 (*n*=492)

Source for verified estimate	**Number of institutions**	**Percentage of responses**
QUEX correct	280	56.9
LIST correct	122	24.8
Neither LIST nor QUEX correct, new data provided	56	11.4
Institution unable to choose, LIST estimate accepted	29	5.9
Other source (i.e., IPEDS) correct	5	1.0

Institutions were allowed to offer as many as three explanations for the discrepancies between their LIST and QUEX estimates. Exhibit 10-8 reports the frequencies of the first- and second- most common explanations institutions offered for these discrepancies. Data for the third most common explanation are not reported, as they represented only 11 institutions.

The most commonly cited reason for discrepancies was the omission of some part-time or full-time faculty from the faculty list provided for sampling. Of institutions that were able to provide an explanation for the discrepancies, nearly one-fifth of them (19.3 percent) reported that some part-time or adjunct faculty were excluded from their list. For institutions that offered at least two reasons for the discrepancy, 12.2 percent of them reported that they excluded some full-time faculty from the original faculty list. The 12.2 percent figure is somewhat deceptive, however, because if institutions that either offered no reason for the discrepancy or that offered no second reason for the discrepancy are omitted, then almost half of the remaining institutions (49.7 percent) reported as their second reason the exclusion of some full-time faculty. These explanations accord with the general pattern of institution acceptance of QUEX estimates as the most reliable estimate for total faculty. Yet, it is also important to point out that 159 reconciled institutions refused or were unable to provide a specific reason for the discrepancies. However, as will be demonstrated later in this chapter, the verified data from these institutions had little impact on the calculation of best estimates.

Another factor in the discrepancies was the time interval (in some instances a year or more) between the time the faculty list was compiled and the time the questionnaire was completed. Therefore, the list did not always include new hires for the fall term. In fact, for institutions that provided an explicit explanation, 10.8 percent of them attributed their discrepancy to the fact that the faculty list they compiled and the institution questionnaire they completed were based on data collected during different academic terms. The retrieval and verification effort indicated that some institutions excluded their medical schools from their lists of faculty, preferring to consider them as separate institutions. This resulted in sizable discrepancies at two major institutions, which included medical school faculty in one set of estimates, but not in the other. Nevertheless, systematic exclusion of medical faculty did not seem to account for the 1987-1992 decline in health sciences faculty noted in the original estimates. Downsizing affected faculty counts at several institutions, although this explanation accounted for only about 2 to 3 percent of discrepancies.

Exhibit 10-8: Explanations institutions gave for discrepancies between LIST and QUEX, fall 1992 (*n*=492) (unweighted frequencies)

Explanation	**1st reason (percent cited)**	**2nd reason (percent cited)**
Different academic base years for LIST & QUEX	1.6	—
Different academic terms used for LIST & QUEX	10.8	—
Layoffs or downsizing	1.6	0.2
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	4.3	0.2
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	1.6	—
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	19.3	1.8
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	4.7	1.8
Some full-time faculty excluded from LIST	2.4	12.2
Some full-time faculty excluded from QUEX	0.8	2.2
Higher QUEX figure is an aggregate of all campuses	3.3	—
Higher LIST figure is an aggregate of all campuses	1.2	0.2
Medical school excluded from LIST	0.4	0.2
Medical school excluded from QUEX	0.6	0.8
Unpaid/Honorary faculty excluded	1.2	—
Ineligible faculty included in error	4.7	0.4
Data entry error by institution	2.0	0.4
Different definitions of full-time faculty used for LIST & QUEX	2.2	0.8
Different definitions of part-time faculty used for LIST & QUEX	1.6	1.8
FTEs used instead of headcount	0.6	—
Other	2.6	1.2
Refusal/no explanation given/no answer	32.3	75.6

The reconciliation effort uncovered an unanticipated explanation for discrepancies. Three institutions provided "full-time equivalents" (FTEs) on the institution questionnaire rather than the actual headcount of part-time faculty. Because the number of part-time instructional faculty an institution employs is a sensitive issue at some campuses, some institutions may prefer to report FTEs rather than individuals employed.

In some instances in which part-time faculty were over reported (on either the faculty sampling list or on the institution questionnaire) the reason involved confusion between the pool of part-time or temporary staff employed by, or available to, the institution during the course of the academic year, and the number actually employed during the fall term.

10.4 Deriving Unweighted "Best Estimates" of NSOPF-93 Faculty

Using the original faculty list data and the data gathered during the reconciliation effort, a "best estimate" of the number of total, full-time and part-time faculty was created for each of the 817 institutions whose faculty members participated in the NSOPF-93 faculty survey. "Best estimates" were defined as each institution's estimate of the faculty population for the 1992 fall term defined by: 1) an estimate verified in the reconciliation and recontact process; or 2) or the original list estimate, if no other verified estimate was available. Procedures for deriving best estimates for total faculty, full-time faculty and part-time faculty are described below.

Total Faculty

The method for calculating best estimates for total faculty at each institution began with the substitution of verified data from the 492 recontacted institutions. Verified data were defined as institution confirmation that either the original list data or the institution questionnaire data were correct or that neither count was correct, and new counts were provided. If the institution verified the QUEX data as a more accurate estimate, the verified QUEX data was substituted for the original list data. If the institution provided a different set of estimates, these new estimates were treated as verified data and substituted for original list data. If an institution verified its original list data, or was unable to confirm LIST or QUEX data or provide new estimates, then the original faculty list total was considered verified data.

The reconciliation effort was able to eliminate ineligible faculty from institution-level totals. This happened when recontacted institutions reported that original faculty lists included ineligible faculty. Twenty-three institutions (4.7 percent) reported that they had included ineligible faculty on their original faculty lists. These institutions' final "best estimate" faculty count reflected the removal of ineligible faculty. In calculating best estimates, it was assumed that all verified faculty counts consisted of eligible faculty only.

Four-hundred and ninety-two institutions provided verified data. Additionally, 16 institutions that had 10 percent or greater LIST/QUEX discrepancies were nonrespondents during reconciliation. Best estimates for these 16 institutions were derived by multiplying the original faculty list data by a ratio adjuster, R_L, defined by:

$$R_L = \frac{\sum(VERIFIED\ DATA)}{\sum(ORIGINAL\ LIST\ DATA)} = \frac{394943}{379402} = 1.04096.$$

Calculation of ratio R_L used data from all 492 reconciled institutions.

Faculty lists were provided by 817 institutions. For the 308 institutions not selected for recontact, and one nonresponding institution in the recontacting effort whose QUEX/LIST discrepancy was less than 10 percent, faculty totals reported on the original faculty lists were used for the best estimate of total faculty.

Full-Time Faculty

Although data for the total number of faculty were available for all 817 institutions, some institutions did not break down their totals into full-time and part-time faculty. A series of steps taken in order, or an "imputation hierarchy," was used to impute "best estimates" of full-time faculty from external sources—data supplied during the reconciliation effort, the faculty list supplied for sampling purposes, or the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire.

The imputation hierarchy for the 492 verified institutions was:

1. Use verified full-time faculty data, if available
2. Else, use original full-time faculty list data, if available
3. Else, use reported data on full-time faculty from the institution questionnaire, if available
4. Else, use imputed data on full-time faculty from the institution questionnaire
5. For all remaining institutions, multiply the best estimate of the institution's total faculty by the ratio of full-time faculty to total faculty computed over all institutions for which verified or list data are available. The result of this calculation was a ratio adjustment factor of .64202.

For the 16 ratio-adjusted institutions, the imputation hierarchy was:

1. Use verified full-time faculty data, if available
2. Else, use original full-time faculty list data, if available × R_L
3. Else, use reported data on full-time faculty from the institution questionnaire, if available × R_Q
4. Else, use imputed data on full-time faculty from the institution questionnaire, if available × R_Q
5. For all remaining cases, multiply the best estimate of the institution's total faculty by the ratio of full-time faculty to total faculty.

The ratios used in these steps are R_L, the ratio described above, and R_Q, a ratio using unweighted data represented in the following equation:

$$R_Q = \frac{\sum(VERIFIED\ DATA)}{\sum(INSTITUTION\ QUEX\ DATA)} = \frac{358181}{357584} = 1.00166$$

Calculation of ratio R_Q used data from the 476 reconciled institutions with available reported institution questionnaire data. No imputed data were used to calculate this ratio.

The imputation hierarchy for the 309 remaining institutions was:

1. Use original full-time faculty list data, if available
2. Else, use reported data on full-time faculty from the institution questionnaire, if available
3. Else, use imputed data on full-time faculty from the institution questionnaire, if available
4. For all remaining institutions, multiply the best estimate of the institution's total faculty by the ratio of full-time faculty to total faculty.

In summary, four data sources were used to derive best estimates of full-time faculty. A total of 481 cases used verified data; 307 cases used original list data; 12 cases used reported institution questionnaire data. Finally, 17 cases were assigned a best estimate for full-time faculty derived by multiplying the institution's best estimate of total faculty by the ratio adjustment factor of .64202. No imputed institution questionnaire data were used to create best estimates for full-time faculty because no cases met the selection criteria for that treatment.

Part-Time Faculty

Best estimates of part-time faculty were calculated simply by subtracting the best estimate of full-time faculty from the best estimate of total faculty at each institution.

10.5 The Impact of the "Best Estimates"

The recontacting and verification effort increased the unweighted total number of faculty enumerated by 15,541. When these best estimates were weighted by the first-stage institution weight for institutions that provided faculty sampling lists, they produced an increase in the estimate of total faculty population in the 492 reconciled institutions of 54,298 faculty members nationwide. Exhibit 10-9 illustrates this increase. It shows the difference between weighed estimates of total faculty from the original faculty list and weighted estimates of total faculty calculated from the "best estimates" based on the verified data for all reconciled institutions. Moreover, differences in weighted estimates are crossed with the explanations institutions provided for their discrepancies. The figures cited in the column marked "institutions" are the weighted frequencies of figures cited under "1st reason" in Exhibit 10-8. Therefore, Exhibit 10-9 provides a graphic illustration of the relative importance of each explanation to the increase or decrease in the faculty population for the reconciled institutions.

By far, the most significant contribution to this increase in total faculty came from those institutions that reported they had failed to enumerate some part-time or adjunct faculty on their original faculty lists. As the exhibit illustrates, these institutions accounted for an increase of 37,183 faculty members in the national faculty population estimate. The institutions that reported they had excluded all part-time faculty from their original lists contributed an additional estimated 14,544 faculty members to the weighted total.

The reconciliation effort also called attention to institutions that included ineligible faculty on their original faculty lists. Almost 6 percent of institutions reported that they included ineligible faculty on either the list or the questionnaire. As a result, these institutions lowered their "best estimate" of total faculty, producing a drop in weighted population estimates for these institutions of 6,167 faculty members. Definitional problems—accounting for different populations of full-time faculty on the list and on the institution questionnaire—meant that, for 2.4 percent of the institutions, the original list included ineligible faculty. The best estimate correction lowered the national population estimate derived from these institutions by 4,475. An almost identical number of faculty (4,514) were dropped from total population estimates due to institution downsizing.

Even more striking were the institutions that explained their discrepancy by reporting that unpaid or honorary faculty were excluded from either their institution questionnaire or their faculty list. Although these institutions accounted for fewer than 1 percent of the weighted total number of reconciled institutions, they accounted for subtraction of an estimate of 9,597 faculty members from the original faculty list. These institutions tended to depend on large numbers of faculty employed by other institutions, such as hospitals or the military. Future cycles of NSOPF-93 will need to take special cases, such as these institutions, into account when describing faculty eligibility rules for institution list preparers.

More than one in four institutions (29.7 percent, weighted) could not supply an explanation for the discrepancy. However, these institutions accounted for a weighted estimate of only 3,206 faculty members toward the net increase of 54,298 in faculty population estimated.

Exhibit 10-9: Difference between verified data and original faculty list by first reason for discrepancy, fall 1992 (weighted data)

Explanation	Institutions	Increase or decrease in faculty population estimate (national)	
	Percent	Number of faculty	Percent
Different academic base years for LIST & QUEX	1.7	505	0.9
Different academic terms used for LIST & QUEX	10.9	4,637	8.5
Layoffs or downsizing	2.5	-4,514	-8.3
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	3.3	14,544	26.8
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	1.3	-15	0.0
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	21.7	37,183	68.5
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	5.5	-538	-1.0
Some full-time faculty excluded from LIST	2.6	3,255	6.0
Some full-time faculty excluded from QUEX	1.0	396	0.7
Higher QUEX figure is an aggregate of all campuses	3.3	9,934	18.3
Higher LIST figure is an aggregate of all campuses	0.7	494	0.9
Medical school excluded from LIST	0.1	1,742	3.2
Medical school excluded from QUEX	0.2	0	0.0
Unpaid/Honorary faculty excluded	0.5	-9,597	-17.7
Ineligible faculty included in error	5.7	-6,167	-11.4
Data entry error by institution	2.3	82	0.2
Different definitions of full-time faculty used for LIST & QUEX	2.4	-4,475	-8.2
Different definitions of part-time faculty used for LIST & QUEX	1.5	308	0.6
FTEs used instead of headcount	0.3	0	0.0
Other	2.5	3,319	6.1
Refusal/no explanation given	29.7	3,206	5.9
Summary	**100.0**	**54,298**	**100.0**

10.6 Poststratification to Best Estimates

The procedures outlined in section 10.5 allowed best estimates to be calculated for total, full-time and part-time faculty for each of the 817 institutions whose faculty members responded to the NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire. Weighting these best estimates by the first-stage institution weight produced the national population estimates reported in Exhibit 10-10.

Following the available "best" estimates, the poststratification adjustment was determined separately for full-time and part-time faculty within each of 15 institution sampling strata. A deeper poststratification defined by instructional/non-instructional status was considered, but after investigation, determined that the sample sizes were too small to support this additional poststratification. Chapter 3 provides a technical description of the final poststratification adjustment.

Poststratification to the best estimates alleviated much of the discrepancy between the national faculty population estimates produced from the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire and those produced from the NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire. More importantly, the best estimates increased the number of part-time faculty for whom the faculty questionnaire accounted. Exhibit 10-11 compares totals and proportions for total, full-time and part-time instructional faculty derived from the NSOPF-88 faculty questionnaire, the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire and the revised NSOPF–93 faculty questionnaire. The proportions of full-time and part-time instructional faculty derived from the best estimates nearly matched the proportions derived from the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire and more closely matched expectations for national faculty population estimates. A comparison of totals and proportions reported in Exhibit 10-11 with those reported in Exhibit 10-1 demonstrates the impact of the post-stratification on estimates of total, full-time and part-time instructional faculty.

Exhibit 10-10: NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire best estimates*

Stratum	**Total faculty**		
	Total	**Full-time**	**Part-time**
TOTAL	1,033,966	598,232	435,735
Private, other Ph.D.	33,494	19,099	14,395
Public comprehensive	151,839	101,238	50,601
Private comprehensive	79,228	40,746	38,481
Public liberal arts	3,240	1,974	1,265
Private liberal arts	63,785	41,997	21,788
Public medical	25,110	17,327	7,783
Private medical	15,540	10,524	5,015
Private religious	7,129	4,398	2,731
Public two-year	303,272	112,538	190,735
Private two-year	11,646	4,667	6,979
Public other	9,196	6,855	2,341
Private other	19,814	8,992	10,821
Public unknown	17,556	6,981	10,575
Private unknown	11,015	6,748	4,267
Research /public, other Ph.D.	282,105	214,147	67,958

*Because of rounding, best estimates of full-time and part-time faculty do not sum to best estimates of total faculty.

Exhibit 10-11: Estimates of total, full-time and part-time faculty teaching for-credit courses from four NSOPF sources

	NSOPF -88				NSOPF-93			
	Institution questionnaire		Faculty questionnaire		Institution questionnaire		Revised faculty questionnaire	
	Total	Pct.	Total	Pct.	Total	Pct.	Total	Pct.
Total faculty	824,685	100	769,825	100	940,192	100	821,700	100
Full-time faculty	513,663	62.3	515,138	66.9	539,210	57.6	478,458	58.2
Part-time faculty	311,022	37.7	254,687	33.1	400,981	42.4	343,242	41.8

10.7 Comparability Issues Regarding NSOPF-93 Faculty Questionnaire Data

10.7.1 Definition of Instructional Faculty

As discussed in Chapter 1, NSOPF-93 and NSOPF-88 defined slightly different target populations. Unlike NSOPF-88, NSOPF-93 included noninstructional faculty. Therefore, to compare similar populations between the two NSOPF rounds requires comparing instructional faculty only.

Analysts wishing to compare NSOPF-93 questionnaire data for instructional faculty with NSOPF-88 questionnaire data for instructional faculty should consider comparing the entire sample of 1988 faculty with the subset of the 1993 faculty who responded "yes" to Question 1, and then responded in Question 1A that "all" or "some of [their] instructional duties related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit." These questions are almost identical to the first two questions on the NSOPF-88 faculty questionnaire. This definition of instructional faculty selects approximately 90 percent of the NSOPF-93 sample for analysis. The proportion of total faculty that instructional faculty represents is consistent with that reported on the institution questionnaire (see Table 2.3 of *Institutional Policies and Practices* [NCES 97-080]). The most efficient way to select these faculty from NSOPF-93 is to use the derived variable X01_1, selecting cases where X01_1=1. X01_1 has been created to flag the faculty members meeting the two conditions discussed above: those who responded "yes" to Question 1, and responded in Question 1a that "all" or "some of [their] instructional duties were related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit."

However, comparisons based on this variable should still be made cautiously. The respondents who received questionnaires in the two rounds were very different. For NSOPF-88, instructions to institutions that supplied faculty lists used for sampling asked that only the names of instructional faculty be supplied. For NSOPF-93, a listing of all faculty was requested. Thus, for NSOPF-88, each institution was allowed to make its own decision about which faculty members belonged in the sample, thereby creating a situation that does not allow subsequent researchers to precisely match the *de facto* sample definition used by institutions in NSOPF-88.

A look at the distribution of faculty across institution types (defined by the modified NSOPF-88 stratification variable, X02_0) indicates that the selection criteria described above yield comparable faculty population estimates. Exhibit 10-12 compares the numbers of faculty in 1988 and in 1993. Exhibit 10-13 compares the percentage distribution of faculty in each institutional stratum in 1988 and in 1993. The percentages are not very different across the two years, although a larger proportion of faculty in two-year institutions in 1993 is observed.

Exhibit 10-12: Number of instructional faculty (X01_1=1), by modified NSOPF-88 stratum

	All		Full-time		Part-time	
	NSOPF-88	**NSOPF-93**	**NSOPF-88**	**NSOPF-93**	**NSOPF-88**	**NSOPF-93**
Public research	119,334	132,717	102,150	107,358	17,184	25,359
Private research	53,120	49,423	41,593	32,164	11,527	17,259
Public doctoral	67,678	73,570	56,308	52,808	11,370	20,762
Private doctoral	39,793	46,699	25,070	28,684	14,723	18,015
Public comprehensive	130,341	141,533	97,104	94,477	33,237	47,056
Private comprehensive	60,457	75,085	36,818	38,561	23,639	36,524
Private liberal arts	55,391	58,961	38,441	38,052	16,950	20,909
Public two-year	200,663	276,292	96,118	109,957	104,545	166,335
Other	43,047	50,654	21,524	26,200	21,524	24,454
All	769,824	904,934	515,125	528,261	254,699	376,673

Exhibit 10-13: Percent of instructional faculty by institution type (X01_1=1), by modified NSOPF-88 stratum

	All		Full-time		Part-time	
	NSOPF-88	**NSOPF-93**	**NSOPF-88**	**NSOPF-93**	**NSOPF-88**	**NSOPF-93**
Public research	16	15	20	20	7	7
Private research	7	5	8	6	5	5
Public doctoral	9	8	11	10	4	6
Private doctoral	5	5	5	5	6	5
Public comprehensive	17	16	19	18	13	12
Private comprehensive	8	8	7	7	9	10
Private liberal arts	7	7	7	7	7	6
Public two-year	26	31	19	21	41	44
Other	6	6	4	5	8	6

10.7.2 Comparison of NSOPF-93 with Other Survey Data

A comparison of NSOPF-93 data with data from the American Association of University Professors and from IPEDS confirmed that the revised faculty dataset provides valid estimates. The AAUP[32] methodology differs from that of NSOPF. AAUP collects aggregate information from over 2,000 colleges and universities. However, due to the large sample, its data provide a point of comparison. To enable comparison between the two datasets, faculty at medical schools and part-time faculty were excluded from the NSOPF-93 data. Also the "base salary" given in NSOPF-93 was converted to a nine-month salary using the same conversion factors as used in the AAUP data.[33] Exhibit 10-14 presents average salaries by rank and type of institution.

---

[32] For a description of the survey, see "Treading water: the annual report of the economic status of the profession, 1992-93" in *Academe*, March-April 1993, pages 8-33

Exhibit 10-14: Comparison of 1992-93 salaries between NSOPF and AAUP surveys

	All		**Doctoral**		**Comprehensive**		**Liberal Arts**		**Two-year**	
	AAUP	NSOPF	AAUP	NSOPF	AAUP	NSOPF	AAUP	NSOPF	AAUP	NSOPF
All	$46,270	$44,916	$52,450	$52,684	$43,950	$41,739	$38,430	$36,135	$37,800	$37,599
Professor	59,520	57,795	66,780	66,964	54,760	51,429	48,390	44,690	47,310	45,867
Associate Professor	44,140	45,488	47,220	50,895	43,680	43,392	38,900	35,273	39,300	38,374
Assistant Professor	36,780	37,872	40,110	42,986	36,160	34,866	32,420	30,184	33,800	33,459
Instructor	27,660	32,308	28,240	31,926	27,590	26,163	26,230	34,360	28,460	33,929
Lecturer	31,010	32,211	33,200	32,485	27,790	33,649	29,250	22,613	25,280	31,582

The table of comparisons suggests that the two sources yield similar salary estimates for the primary academic ranks of assistant, associate and full professors. Likewise, the only type of institution that shows a consistent difference between the estimates from the two surveys is the "liberal arts" category, in which the NSOPF-93 numbers are lower than those reported by AAUP.

---

[33] The full NSOPF sample includes 25,780 respondents; the subset of full-time faculty consists of 18,258. If non-instructional faculty are excluded the sample size is reduced to 16,605. By further excluding medical school faculty, a sample of 15,672 is left in the NSOPF data file. To convert to a nine-month salary, if E47B (length of contract)=8-10, the base salary (E47A) was not converted. If the length of contract was 11 or 12 months, the base salary was multiplied by 9/11 (.818) as had been done with AAUP data. For the cases where the length of contract was listed as 1-7 months, the base salary was divided by the length of contract and multiplied by 9.

Comparisons can also be made between these two surveys and IPEDS data (see Exhibit 10-15), although the published numbers from IPEDS include only faculty on nine-month contracts. For the overall mean, the NSOPF-93 estimate falls between the AAUP and IPEDS estimates. In examining the data by rank, it appears that NSOPF-93 provides lower mean salary estimates for full professors, but somewhat higher mean salary estimates for other ranks.

Exhibit 10-15: Comparison of 1992-93 salaries among AAUP, NSOPF-93 and IPEDS surveys[34]

	AAUP	NSOPF	IPEDS
All	$46,270	$44,916	$44,714
Professor	59,520	57,795	58,788
Associate Professor	44,140	45,488	43,945
Assistant Professor	36,780	37,872	36,625
Instructor	27,660	32,308	28,499
Lecturer	31,010	32,211	30,543

These comparisons indicate that NSOPF-93 data are consistent with what is known from other data sources. Most of the differences are relatively small and easily due to methodological differences between the studies. The NSOPF-93 estimates are based on self-reports of individuals. The other two studies rely on institutional reports of salary means for the entire institution.

10.7.3 A Special Note about Estimates of Health Sciences Faculty

As described in section 10.1, concern for the accuracy of estimates for health sciences faculty also motivated the reconciliation effort. The reconciliation effort helped to identify some institutions that failed to list some health sciences faculty on their original faculty lists, as Exhibit 10-9 shows. But the reconciliation effort did not fully account for the shortfall in health sciences faculty discussed in section 10.1. Using the filter to select faculty with all or some of their instructional duties related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit, the estimates of the national population of health sciences instructional faculty increased to 124,186 on the revised NSOPF-93 faculty data file. Yet, the revised NSOPF-93 population estimate for health sciences faculty fell short of expectations. Moreover, because faculty list data recorded faculty members' disciplines only for faculty in the four NEH disciplines, it was impossible to poststratify to best estimates for health sciences faculty.

In Appendix R, Chapter 5, the problem with health sciences estimates is discussed further and recommendations are made for future rounds of NSOPF.

---

[34] IPEDS data are taken from the *Digest of Education Statistics, 1994*, Table 225, page 236.

11. Recommendations

This chapter summarizes NORC's recommendations for future NSOPF studies, based on the results of the field test and full-scale study, and feedback from a variety of sources: NTRP members, institutional staff (coordinators and respondents), faculty respondents, project staff, and the sponsoring agencies (NCES, NEH, and NSF). These recommendations are designed to reduce institutional and faculty burden, to increase institutional and faculty participation, to enhance the quality of the data, and to make the study more cost-effective.

11.1 Changing Data Collection Time Frames and Commencing List Collection Later

To ensure that part-time staff are not missed in the list enumeration, one member of the NSOPF-93 National Technical Review Panel (NTRP) suggested beginning the list collection effort at the end of the fall term rather than its start as NSOPF-93 did. Sampled institutions would be asked to compile a list of faculty for their *fall term* (encompassing October 15 to ensure comparability between NSOPF cycles). The emphasis should be on the fall term rather than on a specific date. This recommendation should be field-tested prior to the next cycle of NSOPF. One set of sampled institutions, assigned at random, could be asked to compile a list of faculty for their *fall term*. Another set of randomly assigned sampled institutions could be asked to compile a list of faculty employed at their institution on October 15. Discrepancies between institution lists and institution questionnaire counts of faculty could be compared to determine whether one set of lists systematically enumerates a greater number of faculty than the other.

If a later deadline for list collection is established, the institution recruitment phase of data collection could be scheduled earlier: the spring before the fall term for which faculty will be sampled. In both the field test and the full-scale study, relatively few institutions could devote resources necessary to meet the deadline of October 15 given a late August/early September mailout date. The beginning of the academic year is a particularly inopportune time for institutions to make staff resources available to prepare lists of faculty. Given the constraints imposed on faculty data collection by the academic year, it is vital that list collection and processing be completed as early as possible. Therefore, the institutional recruitment phase of data collection could begin in April, with follow-up in May. Institutional staff, unlike faculty, are normally available for most of the summer months, and often have more time and resources to commit to requests for data during these months than during the regular academic year. Exhibit 11-1 presents a sample data collection schedule incorporating these recommendations.

A later start in the list collection effort has multiple implications. A delay of three to four months would mean delaying the faculty survey accordingly. Pushing back the date of the faculty survey, while maintaining the fall term as the time frame for the questionnaire, has the potential to create methodological problems for data quality. The NSOPF-93 faculty data collection effort spanned almost 11 *calendar* months (from the end of January to January, 1994 with a two-month hiatus during the summer). The data collection schedule is bound up with the list collection effort, which, in the case of NSOPF-93, spanned almost nine calendar months (October, 1992 through June, 1993).[35] These scheduling and potential methodological problems would have to be considered in changing the start date for list collection.

---

[35] There is a real possibility of reducing the amount of time needed, possibly from nine months to six, since the nine months required for the NSOPF-93 list collection to a large extent reflected the need to augment the NSOPF-93 sample on two separate occasions.

Exhibit 11-1: Sample data collection schedule

Data collection phase	Time
Institution recruitment: initial	April, 1998
Institution recruitment: follow-up	May, 1998-September, 1998
Institution questionnaire mailout	September, 1998
List collection: initial	November, 1998
List collection: follow-up	January, 1999-March, 1999
Faculty questionnaire mailout/start of interviewing	January, 1999-April, 1999

11.2 Increasing the Use of Telephone Interviews

The NSOPF-93 mixed-mode data collection design (mail with mail and telephone follow-up supplemented by telephone interviews) could be modified. NCES could consider beginning with telephone interviews for part-time faculty with mail and telephone follow-up, while retaining the NSOPF-93 design for full-time faculty. A design employing a significant telephone interview component can shorten the data collection period. However, locating part-time faculty would need to begin earlier, since in the current NSOPF, fewer home addresses were provided for part-time faculty than for full-time faculty. Nonresponding part-time faculty were often no longer employed at the institution when telephone follow-up began. This data collection design change has cost implications. More telephone interviews could also increase item nonresponse for certain items.

Ninety-nine of the institution-level questionnaires were completed with the assistance of an interviewer who collected some information by telephone (or, in four cases, in person). To shorten the data collection period, NSOPF could begin offering small- to medium-sized institutions the option of telephone data collection at the second prompt.

11.3 Providing Institutions with an Information Sheet at the Time of List Collection

The NSOPF-93 verification and retrieval effort described in Chapter 10 demonstrated that when institutions are supplied with discrepant faculty counts, most of them are capable of determining which set of estimates is most accurate and providing the reason(s) for the discrepancy. In view of this finding, NORC proposes providing institutional staff with an information sheet *at the time* of list collection. This information sheet would contain the most current IPEDS estimates, along with the "best estimates" reported for NSOPF-93.[36] The information sheet would also include a statement alerting staff that the NSOPF-93 definition of "faculty" may not be identical to the IPEDS definition and that, in most instances, the institution's estimate of faculty should *exceed* that of IPEDS. (It may or may not exceed the NSOPF-93 totals depending on the actions [e.g., downsizing, increasing staff, etc.] the institution has taken between NSOPF cycles.)

---

[36] Fifty percent or more of the NSOPF-93 institutions are expected to fall into the next NSOPF cycle. The number of institutions is likely to be higher especially if an "overlap" sample design is used in the next round cycle. Even without an overlap design, it is worth noting that 48 percent of the institutions responding to the NSOPF-88 institution questionnaire also appeared in the NSOPF-93 sample.

Institution staff should be asked to check their reported faculty list totals against the IPEDS and/or NSOPF-93 totals. Discrepancies among estimates beyond a specified threshold (say 10 percent) should be explained in a "Comments" section of the information sheet.[37] A sample information sheet, serving as a guide, could be provided. Once received, the institution's faculty list totals (both from the information sheet and from the list) could then be data-entered into a discrepancy module that would be preprogrammed with IPEDS and NSOPF-93 faculty counts to compare faculty counts. Unexplained discrepancies beyond a specified threshold would trigger a retrieval and reconciliation call to the Institutional Coordinator *before* faculty sample selection.

The information sheet will provide the Institutional Coordinator with a means of checking the work of other staff who are usually responsible for preparing the list. This new procedure will encourage the coordinator to check the list compiler's work and to produce an accurate and complete faculty list. Discrepancies can be resolved at the institution level, and this will allow the institutions, in some instances, to correct obvious errors (e.g., exclusion of non-tenure-track faculty or part-time staff) before mailing the list of faculty back to the NSOPF contractor. In other instances, where the institution is simply not equipped to provide a complete or wholly accurate list of faculty, it would alert the institution—and the NSOPF contractor—to any omissions or erroneous inclusions much earlier in the list collection process. Even under this changed procedure the NSOPF contractor would continue to recontact institutions to retrieve data and to reconcile discrepancies during the list collection operation.

Preparation for the data collection phase of NSOPF should include training of a team specializing in resolving discrepancies between faculty lists and institution questionnaires. This team would be prepared to perform necessary reconciliation between divergent faculty counts and to ascertain explanations from institution officials for discrepancies in faculty counts.

11.4 Coordinating Institution Questionnaire Mailing and List Collection

The recommendation in section 11.3 hinges on the availability of institution questionnaires at the time of list collection so that potential discrepancies can be checked and reconciled at this early stage of the operation. This recommendation offers other advantages as well. Discrepancies can be substantially reduced by mailing the institution questionnaire and the list request in the same packet, or at least timing it so that both individual requests are received at the institution at about the same time. By coordinating these requests, NCES can explicitly indicate in the instructions that the estimates requested to certain questions should be identical or very close. Whenever discrepancies are identified, the institution staff would be required to resolve or to explain them. By coupling the timing for both of these requests, the NSOPF data collection contractor will be able to enter the list and questionnaire counts (along with the IPEDS counts) into a discrepancy/verification module to immediately check for discrepancies.[38]

Though this procedure may increase the initial *appearance* of respondent burden to the institution, it also makes it much more likely that institution staff preparing the list and those completing the questionnaire (who are often not the same person) will consult each other and will resolve any discrepancies internally. This procedure is more likely to *reduce* respondent burden at many institutions by eliminating duplication of efforts by separate offices, and by minimizing the number of callback requests.[39]

---

[37] A form in duplicate (or triplicate) could be used so that the institution could maintain a copy for its own records and submit the completed one-page form with its list. Of course, the form and procedures recommended should be field-tested prior to their incorporation into the next cycle of NSOPF.

[38] NORC's Survey Management System (SMS) was customized expressly for NSOPF-93 to permit it to check for discrepancies between list and IPEDS faculty totals and to check specific subgroup totals (i.e., part-time, full-time; racial/ethnic categories). The discrepancy module was initially created to check list, questionnaire, and IPEDS totals against each other, but because the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire was delayed, only the LIST/IPEDS check was possible.

11.5 Routing Institutional Coordinator Packet to Institutional Research Director

NSOPF-93 experience showed that the individual most familiar with the data requested on the faculty sampling lists, and, therefore, the most appropriate Institutional Coordinator, is the director of institutional research. Moreover, directors of institutional research often have a high level of interest in the research topics covered by NSOPF. Therefore, whenever an institution employs an individual in the capacity of director of institutional research, the cover letter (currently sent to the institution's chief administrative officer) and the accompanying Confirmation Form could be sent directly to that person, with a copy sent to the institution's Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). Only in the absence of a director of institutional research would another individual (such as an academic dean) be named to serve as coordinator. This should speed routing of mail, reduce the number of remails required, and, in many cases, assure a knowledgeable and sympathetic review of the request.

Misrouting and delays in routing of the institutional coordinator packet were frequent problems in the list collection effort, as evidenced by the high rate of remails—over 40 percent—to CAOs and coordinators. In some instances, a CAO with limited time to personally review mail reported the package as not having been received, although it had been sent to the correct address. Often, a "gatekeeper" routed the package to another institutional official before the CAO could review the materials. Although this official may be best suited to serve as Institutional Coordinator, there is no guarantee that this is the case. If the package is routed to a person who is either unfamiliar with or unsympathetic to the aims of research studies such as NSOPF, or who lacks knowledge of what faculty data the institution has available, it becomes much more difficult to obtain the institution's participation, as well as to obtain high-quality data within set time constraints.

11.6 Changing Institution Questionnaire Instructions and Questions

Some of the questionnaire instructions and questions in the institution questionnaire may have inadvertently contributed to the discrepancies in faculty estimates noted in Chapter 10. To avoid confusion in Questions 1A-D between the total pool of part-time and temporary faculty *available* to an institution and the total *employed* (an unintended ambiguity that caused problems for some institutions because of how part-time and temporary staff are treated), we would recommend amending this question or creating separate questions to ask for *both* the total number of available staff and the number employed during the fall term. This separation would allow institutions to report the status of their temporary and part-time staff more accurately and without the confusion some institutions experienced. Even though some institutions may only be able to provide one set of these estimates, it will at least be completely clear which set of figures the institution is providing.

Another area of ambiguity appeared in the actual estimate of faculty. Some institutions provided estimates of full-time equivalents (FTEs) rather than the requested headcount of individuals. We would recommend amending the instructions to the institution questionnaire to make clear that we are seeking a *headcount of faculty*, and not a count of FTEs (or positions) unless it is expressly stated in the question. (Although we would not recommend it, alternatively we could ask for both FTEs and a headcount. This approach might increase respondent burden slightly; however, some institutions may feel more comfortable providing a headcount if it is accompanied by the total number of FTEs.)

---

[39] It would be prudent to explain the reasons for this procedure to the institution in the introductory letter and materials at the time of list collection. The more participants understand at the outset, the more likely they are to "buy in" to survey procedures.

A number of institutions excluded medical or professional institutions or satellite campuses that should have been included. Explicit instructions should be provided in both the questionnaire and the list collection packet to include all such institutions and campuses that do not file separately for IPEDS; if possible, a list of institutions and campuses to be included could be printed in the packet given each institution, based on IPEDS information. The institution would be instructed to notify the data collection contractor about any changes in the status of the listed institutions and satellite campuses. If an institution has any questions about which institutions and campuses to include, that institution would be instructed to contact the data collection contractor for assistance.

A small number of institutions erroneously included all staff (including maintenance and clerical staff) at Questions 1A-D. We believe this error could have been avoided had the respondents carefully read the glossary on the front inside cover of the questionnaire. Since these individuals clearly did not make this effort, we recommend including an additional instruction to accompany Questions 1A-D and other questions that ask for counts of "faculty/staff," that would briefly repeat the general instruction and reference the glossary.

Other changes should be made to the institution questionnaire to reduce respondent burden. Information on benefits available to faculty should not be asked as part of the institution questionnaire that is mailed with the list collection packet. In NSOPF-93, these items elicited high item nonresponse, as discussed in Chapter 8. In the next NSOPF, benefits questions could be asked separately, at a later time. Ideally, such information could be obtained directly from the staff or department responsible for administering benefits programs at each participating institution, or in some cases, at the parent institution. This recommendation should be field-tested.

11.7 Eliminating Option of Sending Computer Tapes

Due to the level of effort required in their processing, we recommend deleting any reference to computer tapes in the list preparation materials. Although we do recognize that many institutions, especially those with large numbers of faculty, may need to submit their lists on computer tape, processing NSOPF-93 faculty lists in computer tape format was costly both in time and effort, and required higher levels of staff to complete. In order to load computer tapes, a programmer had to be available to convert the tape into a format that could be loaded, if necessary, and to monitor the loading process. Seven percent (61 out of 817) of the institutions sent their faculty lists as computer tapes; 8 sent only the tape and 53 sent a tape and a hardcopy printout. In general, lists submitted on computer tape either required retrieval to obtain a usable list, or the hardcopy list was used in place of the tape.

11.8 Providing Diskette or List Layout Example

List preparation instructions, which were developed in conjunction with NORC programmers and systems specialists, provided institutions with a standard layout with which to format their lists (see Appendix K). By providing this convention, the number of unique problems and types of lists encountered by list processing staff were greatly reduced, thus decreasing list processing time. These changes to list preparation materials dramatically increased the ease and speed by which faculty lists were processed.

However, even with these conventions in place, institutions still varied in the individual layout of their faculty lists. Various programs were used to reformat electronic files that were not laid out correctly, or were otherwise formatted in such a way that they could not be sampled. In addition, many institutions sent diskettes that other computers were unable to read.

For the next NSOPF, list preparation instructions should be augmented by providing institutions with a formatted diskette that contains an example of the file layout requested. This diskette could also include a simple interactive database management program that could run diagnostic checks on the list data to assure that data are supplied according to specifications. Even though not all institutions are equipped with the same hardware and/or software, we believe that the availability of this aid will enhance the probability of our receiving electronic files in the preferred format. Institutions should also be given the option of submitting their faculty lists on CD-ROM.

11.9 Scanning Hardcopy Faculty Lists

NORC recommends investigating the possibility of using computer scanners to convert hardcopy lists into an easier format. With the development of new and more efficient scanning devices, it is conceivable that the need for keying/manual data entry of hardcopy lists could be eliminated by the next survey wave. Time spent on coding and keying information from hardcopy lists was reduced substantially from the field test, but was still greater than the time required to process most electronic files. Some institutions had large and time-consuming hardcopy lists of faculty that could have been electronically processed in a fraction of the time. With scanning devices, printed data could be scanned and converted into an electronic format that could then be used to sample faculty.

11.10 Using the Internet

As the use and accessibility of the "information superhighway" is increasing across organizations—especially academic institutions—the use of the Internet as a mode of transmitting and receiving information should be examined. Even though transmitting faculty lists via the Internet was not formally given as an option in the institution recruitment and list collection materials in the main study, some institutions chose to submit their lists in that fashion. NORC believes that providing this service will greatly enhance the efficiency and timeliness of list collection in the next survey wave. The NSOPF data collection contractor could set up a secure World Wide Web or "gopher" site that would include an "FAQ" (for "frequently asked questions") screen and examples of the standard faculty list that institutions should provide. NORC's experience with a Web site constructed for another education study suggests that this option facilitates list collection and insures data confidentiality and security. Institutions "upload" their lists to the site server, from which list collection is conducted. With the Internet becoming a much more common tool for research and communication, it is likely that persons ultimately responsible for creating electronic datafiles would be adept at handling, and would prefer using, this mode of information transfer.

11.11 Maximizing Early Awareness of the Study

In a time of fiscal constraints, and many competing research demands, some institutions find it necessary to limit their participation in research projects to those they deem most in their interest. It is vital that institutional officials be provided with enough information about NSOPF to make an informed decision on their participation before institutional resources are committed to other projects. Therefore, we recommend that appropriate organizations (e.g., the Association for Institutional Research, the National Education Association) be provided with ongoing information about study plans and results well in advance of the next field period. This information can be disseminated to members through newsletters, bulletins, and NCES' participation in conferences.

11.12 Requesting Address Updates from Institutional Coordinator

The lists obtained from institutions are often out-of-date, particularly with regard to address information for part-time faculty, many of whom may have moved to other institutions. However, Institutional Coordinators are often able to update address information on sampled faculty, and can confirm their current status at the institution (as well as their faculty status as of the previous fall term). Hence, prior to telephone follow-up, we recommend sending the lists of sampled faculty back to coordinators for confirmation of locating information and faculty status. In this way, the level of locating effort required to reach faculty can be substantially reduced.

11.13 Requesting System-wide Data

Faculty benefits policies in state and city college systems (and large institutions with autonomous, but related, "satellite" institutions) are generally uniform across institutions. NSOPF should ask for (and use) system-wide sources for these institutions to minimize the burden on individual institutions. NSOPF staff can identify these sources in the initial mailing or follow-up phone call. This kind of information can also be collected earlier by assigning staff to investigate centralized sources for system-wide benefits policies.

11.14 Cognitive Research to Aid Institution Data Collection

One method to inform the next NSOPF round may be the use of cognitive research, such as focus groups, on a crossectional sample of institution officials who would be charged with completing NSOPF faculty sampling lists, institution questionnaires and other materials. The purpose of this research would be to ascertain what procedures institutions follow to gather the data that NSOPF requires and to discover problems institutions face when complying with NSOPF requests. A special effort might be focused on smaller, two-year institutions, those which showed the greatest discrepancies between their faculty lists and their institution questionnaires. The results of this cognitive research could help the NSOPF contractor to devise procedures and instructions to institutions which maximize institution participation and which minimize error.

11.15 Changes to Faculty Questionnaire

In order to develop a more complete profile of faculty, we recommend adding items that obtain more information on what constitutes advising or supervising academic activities for credit, non-credit courses, and advising or supervising noncredit academic activities. These questions should be field tested, and focus groups—particularly with health sciences faculty—should also be conducted before being incorporated in the next full-scale NSOPF. An option "none of the above" should be added to the code for academic degree for those faculty respondents who do not have a degree or formal award (Question C16).

For the Question C23 and its subparts on credit courses, some respondents in the current NSOPF reported "0" credit hours, "0" hours per week, or "0" students enrolled. Other respondents reported high numbers for these and other items at Question C23. Some respondents also reported "0" basic salary from the institution at E47, or much higher than average salaries for their academic rank. Instructions for Questions C23 and E47 may need to be modified. Focus group discussion could determine what modifications should be made for the next NSOPF field test, or if individual items in each question should be modified and field-tested.

Subparts of Question C33 and C35 had high item nonresponse in the current survey. Consideration should be given to combining funding sources for the next NSOPF, such as combining business/industry with "other" sources, and state/local government with federal government. Items requesting information on research funding (the respondent's role as investigator or staff, total funds for the 1992-93 institution year, and how funds were used (subitems of C33) had high item nonresponse. For the next NSOPF, some consideration should be given to obtaining this information elsewhere. At Question C35, consideration should be given to asking only if different types of institution funding were used, and deleting the items asking if such funding was available.

11.16 Nonresponse Adjustment by Faculty Discipline

For NSOPF-93, nonresponse adjustments on the faculty dataset were performed for two main faculty variables: race/ethnicity and full-time/part-time status. Another possible nonresponse adjustment could be performed for faculty discipline. This recommendation should be carefully considered. It would improve the accuracy of estimates of faculty population in one of the chief means by which analysts classify faculty. Such a nonresponse adjustment would also help to overcome problems noted in such program areas as health sciences if it could be established that nonresponse contributed to shortfalls in expected estimates of faculty population in those areas. To properly carry out a nonresponse adjustment by discipline, faculty sampling lists will have to code faculty discipline for every faculty member listed. This requirement could increase institution burden. This requirement could also introduce a level of confusion into institutions' classification of their faculty members' disciplines, as institutions would have to decide how to classify faculty members with joint appointments in more than one department and other like cases. To lessen institution burden, institutions could be asked to code faculty sampling lists only on the 10 program areas reported at the faculty questionnaire derived variable X0A12. No matter how discipline codes are recorded on faculty sampling lists, they would still require very detailed and specific instructions to list preparers.

11.17 Number of Replicate Weights

Analysts should be cautious about use of BHS estimated variances that relate to one stratum or to a group of two or three strata. Such variance estimates may be based upon far fewer than 32 replicates, and thus the variance of the variance estimator may be large. Analysts who use either the faculty file or the institution file should also be cautious about cross-classifying data so deeply that the resulting estimates are based upon a very small number of observations. The accuracy of NSOPF-93 statistics should be interpreted in light of estimated standard errors and of the number of observations used in the statistics. In light of these issues, future NSOPFs may consider creating a greater number of replicate weights (i.e. greater than 32) for BHS variance estimation.

11.18 Poststratification to Institution Questionnaire Counts

The recontacting and reconciliation effort detailed in Chapter 10 and Appendix R showed that recontacted institutions most often chose institution questionnaire faculty counts as the most accurate enumeration of their faculty. The poststratification adjustment performed on the NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire datafile brought national population estimates for the faculty file more in line with the national population estimates the institution questionnaire produced. Therefore, to reduce measurement error on the faculty datafile and to ensure consistency between the institution and faculty datasets, the NSOPF contractor could poststratify faculty questionnaire datafiles to faculty population estimates produced from the institution questionnaire. This recommendation has the added attraction of allowing for a prompt estimation of national faculty population totals without having to conduct an extensive reconciliation effort, as discussed in Chapter 10. Of course, if recommendation 11.3 helps to decrease the discrepancy between institution questionnaire totals and faculty list totals during data collection, there may be no need for poststratification.

11.19 Overlap Sample Design for Future NSOPF Cycles

Composite estimation is not possible when comparing estimates between NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93. An overlap design for future NSOPF cycles will increase the precision for estimates of change since NSOPF-93, even if change is estimated simply by differences between the statistics for two time points. Even greater precision can be achieved by relying on a composite estimator, which can be viewed as a weighted average of two estimates of change, one based on the overlapping institutions and one based on the nonoverlapping institutions. The amount of weight given to the overlap-based estimate of change varies directly with the correlation over time for the characteristic of interest. Overlap can be built into the next cycle of the study. At that point, it will be possible to calculate the correlations and to confidently predict the gains achievable from composite estimation, both for estimating change and also for making cross-sectional estimates. The precision of the estimates can be enhanced even if composite estimation is not used. Building in overlap will allow the use of composite estimation if desired. To that end, a machine-readable copy of the sampling frame for the NSOPF-93 institutional sample has been produced. This data file includes, for all institutions in the frame, (a) selection probabilities, (b) stratum codes, (c) indicators as to whether the institution was or was not selected, and (d) indicators as to whether the institution did or did not participate. Items (a), (b), and (c) are crucial for designing the overlap, and (d) is necessary for improving the efficiency of the overlap.

Appendix A

1988 NSOPF Questionnaire for Departments

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
April 1988

Dear Colleague:

There is very little current and comprehensive information about higher education faculty in this country. For this reason, the Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education is conducting a national survey of faculty in American colleges and universities. This study, which is cosponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, is designed to provide reliable and current data for higher-education researchers, as well as planners and policymakers at all levels (institutional and governmental). The Center has contracted with SRI International (formerly Stanford Research Institute) and the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State University to conduct the study.

This National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) is the most comprehensive study of faculty in postsecondary educational institutions ever undertaken. It will provide national profiles of faculty members regarding their backgrounds, responsibilities, career and retirement plans, compensation, benefits, and attitudes about their jobs and various academic issues. Additionally, information on institutional and departmental characteristics, policies, and practices that affect faculty will be collected from institutional spokespersons and chairpersons of selected departments (or comparable academic units).

Your institution has been randomly selected to participate in the 1987-88 NSOPF. Although your participation is voluntary, it is particularly important because this survey will establish a baseline for any future profiles of faculty.

Individual responses and all information that would permit identification of individuals will be kept strictly confidential, in accordance with the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Acts of 1976. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries and will not be disclosed to any group or individual.

Please complete this questionnaire as soon as possible and return it directly to SRI in the enclosed business-reply envelope. When the study is completed, the Center will provide your institution with a summary report of the findings. Study reports and data tapes also will be available upon request to researchers who wish to explore the study issues further. If you have any questions or comments concerning this study, please telephone Dr. Susan Russell, Project Director, of SRI International (415-859-4164).

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Emerson J. Elliott, Director

OMB Clearance # 1850-0608
Expiration Date: 7/89

NATIONAL SURVEY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Questionnaire for Departments (or Comparable Academic Units)

PLEASE READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE UNIT INDICATED ON THE FRONT PAGE LABEL.

This questionnaire was designed to be completed by chairs of selected departments (or comparable academic units) in 2- and 4-year postsecondary institutions of all sizes. Because there is substantial variation in both departments/units and postsecondary institutions, some of the questions may not be worded quite appropriately for your situation. We would appreciate your tolerance of these difficulties. For example, we have used the term "department" throughout the questionnaire, but the unit for which you are responding may be called something else.

If your institution has multiple campuses, please answer only for the campus to which the questionnaire was addressed.

If your department has BOTH lay faculty and those assigned by a religious order, a few questions may require different answers for the two groups. If this occurs, please call Dr. Susan Russell (collect) at 415-859-4164 for instructions on how to proceed. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause you.

Obtaining counts of different kinds of faculty is an important part of this study. If you cannot provide "hard" data for some of the "numbers" questions, please provide your best estimates.

Many of our questions ask about the status of your department during the 1987 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on October 15, 1987.

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

PLEASE READ:

By full-time instructional faculty, we mean those members of your department's instruction/research staff who are employed full-time by your department and whose regular assignment includes instruction.

Include:

- *Regular full-time instructional faculty.*
- *Those who contribute their services, such as members of religious orders.*
- *Those on sabbatical leave.*
- *Administrators such as department chairs who hold full-time faculty rank and whose regular assignment includes instruction.*

Do not include:

- *Replacements for faculty on sabbatical leave.*
- *Others with adjunct, acting, or visiting appointments.*
- *Faculty on leave without pay.*
- *Teaching assistants.*

REMINDER: BY "DEPARTMENT," WE MEAN THE UNIT INDICATED ON THE FRONT PAGE LABEL.

1. During the 1987 Fall Term, did your department have any full-time instructional faculty (as defined above)? *Please include those with joint appointments. (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

Yes 1

No . . . . 2 —> SKIP TO PAGE 12

Questions about your full-time instructional faculty are on pages 2 - 11.
Questions about your part-time instructional faculty are on pages 12 - 17.

2. How many instructional faculty members who are employed full-time by your institution hold joint appointments in your department and some other department at your institution?
(PLEASE SPECIFY; ENTER "0" IF NONE)

Number with joint appointments: ________

3. Does your institution have a tenure system for any of your department's full-time instructional faculty?

Yes 1

No 2

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

4. How many full-time instructional faculty members were there in each of the categories below in your department during the 1987 Fall Term?

If your institution does not have a tenure system for full-time faculty, please complete the "Not Tenure Track" column.

If there are no academic ranks in your department, please complete only the line for "other full-time instructional faculty."

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

	1987 FALL TERM: FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
	Tenure track		
	Tenured	Not tenured	Not tenure track
Professor	____	____	____
Associate Professor	____	____	____
Assistant Professor	____	____	____
Instructor	____	____	____
Lecturer	____	____	____
Other full-time instructional faculty, including no academic ranks	____	____	____
TOTAL	____	____	____

5. During the 1987 Fall Term, how many full-time instructional faculty with visiting, acting, or adjunct appointments did your department have?

Note: These individuals should not appear in your other counts of full-time instructional faculty provided in this questionnaire.

(PLEASE SPECIFY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

____

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

6. Please indicate below the number of your department's full-time instructional faculty members by sex and race (minority/nonminority) during the 1987 Fall Term.

If there are no academic ranks in your department, please complete only the line for "other full-time instructional faculty".

NOTE: By "minority," we mean Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Aleut, Eskimo, Asian, or Pacific Islander.

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

	1987 FALL TERM: FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			
	Minority		Nonminority	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Professor	______	______	______	______
Associate Professor	______	______	______	______
Assistant Professor	______	______	______	______
Instructor	______	______	______	______
Lecturer	______	______	______	______
Other full-time instructional faculty, including no academic ranks	______	______	______	______
TOTAL	______	______	______	______

7. How many full-time instructional faculty did your department have in each of the following categories?

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

Number on the staff during the 1986 Fall Term: ______
(NOTE: Nineteen eighty-six)

Number who retired between the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term: ______

Number who left the institution between the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term, for reasons other than retirement: ______

Number on the staff at the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term: ______

IF NO TENURE SYSTEM, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 13, ON PAGE 6.

8. During the 1986-87 academic year, how many instructional faculty in your department were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?
(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

Number considered for tenure: ________

Number granted tenure: ________

9. During the 1986 and 1987 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track instructional faculty did your department have?
(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

	1986 Fall Term	1987 Fall Term
Tenured instructional faculty:	________	________
Tenure-track (but not tenured) instructional faculty:	________	________

10. How many tenured instructional faculty (if any) left your department for each of the following reasons between the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term?
(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

Through retirement: ________

To assume another position: ________

Formally removed for cause (e.g, for neglect of duty, incompetence, moral turpitude, fraud, or insubordination): ________

Dismissed because of institutional budget pressures or program closures: ________

For other reasons (e.g., death, disability): ________

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

11. Is there a maximum number of years an instructional faculty member can be on a tenure track and not receive tenure in your department?

    (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY THE MAXIMUM, IF APPLICABLE)

    Yes 1
    MAXIMUM: ______

    No 2

12. Does your institution or department currently have an upper limit (either formal or informal) on the percentage of full-time instructional faculty in your department who are tenured?

    (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY PERCENTAGE, IF APPLICABLE)

    Yes 1
    UPPER LIMIT: ______%

    No 2

13. During the 1987 Fall Term, for how many unfilled full-time instructional faculty positions in your department were candidates being recruited? *Please include positions that were* *__temporarily__* *filled by teaching assistants, or by faculty with adjunct, acting, or visiting appointments.*

    (PLEASE SPECIFY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

    ____

    IF NONE, SKIP TO QUESTION 15

14. For which of the following reasons did your department have these unfilled positions?

    (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

    Unable to locate qualified applicants 1
    Qualified applicants would not accept our terms of employment (e.g., salary, location, etc.) 2
    Resources not available for hiring 3
    Declining enrollment 4
    Decided to fill position with part-timer(s) 5
    Vacancy occurred too late to fill position 6
    Other reasons (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW) 7

    ____

    ____

15. Generally speaking, how important is each of the following factors in granting tenure in your department?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH FACTOR)

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Quality of teaching	1	2	3
Quality of research	1	2	3
Number of publications	1	2	3
Quality of publications	1	2	3
Institutional activities or service	1	2	3
Community or professional service	1	2	3
Reputation in their professional field	1	2	3
Reputation of graduate institution/program (i.e., where highest degree was awarded)	1	2	3
Highest degree	1	2	3
Affirmative Action or Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) considerations	1	2	3
Candidate's ability to obtain outside funding	1	2	3
"Fit" with this department or institution	1	2	3
"Fit" with student body	1	2	3

Other important factors in the tenure decision (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)

____

____

16. *In practice*, at what level is each of the following decisions *most often* made?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	LEVEL AT WHICH DECISION IS MADE MOST OFTEN:				
	Department chair or faculty	College/school (within larger institution)	Institution	Other*	Does not apply
a. Selection of a given individual for a full-time instructional faculty position	1	2	3	4	0
b. Decision to grant tenure	1	2	3	4	0
c. Decision to deny tenure	1	2	3	4	0
d. Decision to grant a promotion in rank	1	2	3	4	0
e. Decision to give a merit raise	1	2	3	4	0

**PLEASE SPECIFY "OTHER" RESPONSES:*______________________________

____

____

17. Are any of your department's full-time instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY PERCENT, IF APPLICABLE)

Yes 1
WHAT PERCENT? ______%

No 2

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

18. Generally speaking, how important is each of the following factors in hiring full-time entry-level instructional faculty in your department? *(If you have a tenure system, please answer for entry-level tenure track faculty.)*

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH FACTOR)

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Extent of teaching experience	1	2	3
Quality of teaching	1	2	3
Extent of research experience	1	2	3
Quality of research	1	2	3
Number of publications	1	2	3
Quality of publications	1	2	3
Community or professional service	1	2	3
Reputation in their professional field	1	2	3
Reputation of graduate institution/program (i.e., where highest degree was awarded)	1	2	3
Highest degree	1	2	3
Academic record	1	2	3
Affirmative Action or Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) considerations	1	2	3
Candidate's ability to obtain outside funding	1	2	3
Related job experience	1	2	3
Salary requirements	1	2	3
Programmatic needs	1	2	3
"Fit" with this department or institution	1	2	3
"Fit" with student body	1	2	3

Other important factors in hiring entry-level full-time instructional faculty
(PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

19. In which of the following ways, if any, is the teaching performance of full-time faculty assessed in your department?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Evaluations by students	1
Student test scores	2
Student placement or honors	3
Other measures of student performance	4
Department/division chair evaluations	5
Dean evaluations	6
Peer evaluations	7
Self evaluations	8
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)	9

____

Teaching performance not assessed for full-time faculty	0

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

20. Listed below are some ways that institutions may use discretionary funds for the professional development of faculty members. For each, please indicate whether it is:

- Not available to any of your department's full-time instructional faculty,
- Available only to full-time instructional faculty in your department who have a certain rank, tenure, or years of service, OR
- Available to full-time instructional faculty in your department with no rank, tenure, or years of service restrictions.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

		AVAILABLE TO FULL-TIME FACULTY:	
Discretionary funding for:	NOT AVAILABLE TO ANY FULL-TIME FACULTY	Some rank, tenure, years of service restrictions	No rank, tenure, years of service restrictions
Tuition remission (to faculty themselves) at this or other institutions	1	2	3
Professional association memberships	1	2	3
Registration fees, etc. for workshops, conferences, etc.	1	2	3
Professional travel	1	2	3
Sabbatical leave	1	2	3
Training to improve research skills	1	2	3
Training to improve teaching skills	1	2	3
Paid leave to gain work experience	1	2	3
Retraining for fields in higher demand	1	2	3

PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

PLEASE READ:

By part-time instructional faculty, we mean those members of your department's instruction/research staff who are employed part-time in your department and whose regular assignment in your department includes instruction.

Include:

- *Regular part-time instructional faculty.*
- *Those who contribute their services, such as members of religious orders.*
- *Part-time replacements for faculty on sabbatical leave or leave without pay.*
- *Others with part-time adjunct, acting, or visiting appointments.*

Do not include:

- *Faculty on leave without pay.*
- *Teaching assistants.*

21. During the 1987 Fall Term, did your department have any part-time instructional faculty (as defined above)?

Yes 1
No . . . . 2 —> SKIP TO END

22. During the 1987 Fall Term, how many part-time instructional faculty did your department have?

(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF "HARD" DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE)

23. How many of these part-timers (as indicated in Question 22) had adjunct, acting, or visiting appointments?

(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF "HARD" DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE)

PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

24. During the 1987 Fall Term, how many student teaching assistants did your department have?
Note: These individuals should not appear in your other counts of part-time instructional faculty.
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF "HARD" DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE)

____

25. Does your institution have a tenure system for any of your department's part-time instructional faculty?

Yes 1
No 2

26. Please indicate below the number of your department's part-time instructional faculty members by sex and race (minority/nonminority) during the 1987 Fall Term.

If there are no academic ranks in your department, please complete only the line for "other part-time instructional faculty".

NOTE: By "minority," we mean American Indian, Aleut, Eskimo, Asian, Pacific Islander, black, and Hispanic.

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF "HARD" DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

1987 FALL TERM: PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

	Minority		Nonminority	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Professor				
Associate Professor				
Assistant Professor				
Instructor				
Lecturer				
Other part-time instructional faculty, including no academic ranks				
TOTAL				

27. Generally speaking, how important is each of the following factors in selecting part-time instructional faculty in your department?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH FACTOR)

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Extent of teaching experience	1	2	3
Quality of teaching	1	2	3
Extent of research experience	1	2	3
Quality of research	1	2	3
Number of publications	1	2	3
Quality of publications	1	2	3
Community or professional service	1	2	3
Reputation in their professional field	1	2	3
Reputation of graduate institution/program (i.e., where highest degree was awarded)	1	2	3
Highest degree	1	2	3
Academic record	1	2	3
Affirmative Action or Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) considerations	1	2	3
Candidate's ability to obtain outside funding	1	2	3
Related job experience	1	2	3
Salary requirements	1	2	3
Programmatic needs	1	2	3
"Fit" with this department or institution	1	2	3
"Fit" with student body	1	2	3

Other important factors in hiring
part-time instructional faculty
(PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)

PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

28. In practice, at what level is each of the following decisions most often made?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	LEVEL AT WHICH DECISION IS MADE MOST OFTEN:				
	Department chair or faculty	College/school (within larger institution)	Institution	Other*	Does not apply
a. Selection of a given individual for a part-time instructional faculty position	1	2	3	4	0
b. Decision to grant a promotion in rank to a part-time instructional faculty member	1	2	3	4	0
c. Decision to give a merit raise to a part-time instructional faculty member	1	2	3	4	0

**PLEASE SPECIFY "OTHER" RESPONSES:*____

____

29. Are any of your department's part-time instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY PERCENT, IF APPLICABLE)

Yes 1
WHAT PERCENT? _____%

No 2

PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

30. Generally speaking, how important is each of the following factors in decisions about retaining part-time instructional faculty in your department?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH FACTOR)

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Quality of teaching	1	2	3
Quality of research	1	2	3
Number of publications	1	2	3
Quality of publications	1	2	3
Institutional activities or service	1	2	3
Community or professional service	1	2	3
Reputation in their professional field	1	2	3
Reputation of graduate institution/program (i.e., where highest degree was awarded)	1	2	3
Highest degree	1	2	3
Affirmative Action or Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) considerations	1	2	3
Programmatic needs	1	2	3
"Fit" with this department or institution	1	2	3
"Fit" with student body	1	2	3

Other important factors in retaining
part-time instructional faculty
(PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)

____

____

PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

31. Listed below are some ways that departments may use discretionary funds for the professional development of faculty members. Please indicate which are available to *any* of your department's **part-time** instructional faculty.
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Tuition remission (to faculty themselves)	1
Professional association memberships	2
Registration fees, etc. for workshops, conferences, etc.	3
Professional travel	4
Sabbatical leave	5
Training to improve research skills	6
Training to improve teaching skills	7
Paid leave to gain work experience	8
Retraining for fields in higher demand	9
None of the above	0

32. In which of the following ways, if any, is the teaching performance of **part-time** faculty assessed in your department?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Evaluations by students	1
Student test scores	2
Student placement or honors	3
Other measures of student performance	4
Department/division chair evaluations	5
Dean evaluations	6
Peer evaluations	7
Self evaluations	8
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)	9
______________________________	
Teaching performance *not* assessed for part-time faculty	0

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Please return this completed questionnaire in the enclosed franked envelope to:

National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty
SRI International
P.O. Box 2124
Menlo Park, CA 94025-2124

Appendix B

1988 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
April 1988

Dear Faculty Member:

There is very little current and comprehensive information about higher education faculty in this country. For this reason, the Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education is conducting a national survey of faculty in American colleges and universities. This study, which is cosponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, is designed to provide reliable and current data for higher-education researchers, as well as planners and policymakers at all levels (institutional and governmental). The Center has contracted with SRI International (formerly Stanford Research Institute) and the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State University to conduct the study.

This National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) is the most comprehensive study of faculty in postsecondary educational institutions ever undertaken. It will provide national profiles of faculty members regarding their backgrounds, responsibilities, career and retirement plans, compensation, benefits, and attitudes about their jobs and various academic issues. Additionally, information on institutional and departmental characteristics, policies, and practices that affect faculty will be collected from institutional spokespersons and chairpersons of selected departments (or comparable academic units).

You and several of your colleagues at your institution are part of a randomly drawn national sample of instructional faculty who are being asked to contribute to this study. While your participation is voluntary, it is particularly important because this survey will establish a baseline for any future profiles of faculty.

Individual responses and all information which would permit identification of individuals will be kept strictly confidential, in accordance with the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Acts of 1976. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries and will not be disclosed to any group or individual.

Please complete this questionnaire as soon as possible and return it directly to SRI in the enclosed business-reply envelope. When the study is completed, the Center will provide your institution with a summary report of the findings. Study reports and data tapes also will be available upon request to researchers who wish to explore the study issues further. If you have any questions or comments concerning this study, please telephone Dr. Susan Russell, Project Director, of SRI International (415-859-4164).

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Emerson J. Elliott, Director

OMB Clearance # 1850-0608
Expiration Date: 7/89

NATIONAL SURVEY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Faculty Questionnaire

PLEASE NOTE:

Many of our questions ask about your activities during the 1987 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on October 15, 1987.

All questions that ask about your current position or institution refer to your position during the 1987 Fall Term at the institution to which this questionnaire was addressed.

This questionnaire was designed to be completed by both full- and part-time instructional faculty in 2- and 4-year postsecondary institutions of all kinds. Because this is such a diverse group, some of the questions may not be worded quite appropriately for your situation. We would appreciate your tolerance of these difficulties.

1. During the 1987 Fall Term, did you have any instructional duties at this institution (e.g., teaching one or more courses, advising or supervising students' academic activities)?

   (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   Yes 1

   No 2

   IF NO, PLEASE STOP HERE AND RETURN THIS PACKET TO SRI IN THE ENCLOSED FRANKED ENVELOPE.

2. During the 1987 Fall Term, were at least some of your instructional duties related to for-credit courses, or were all of your instructional duties related to noncredit courses?

   (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   At least some of my instructional duties were related to for-credit courses 1

   All of my instructional duties were related to noncredit courses 2

   IF ALL NONCREDIT, PLEASE STOP HERE AND RETURN THIS PACKET TO SRI IN THE ENCLOSED FRANKED ENVELOPE.

3. During the 1987 Fall Term, were you on sabbatical from another institution?

   Yes 1

   No 2

A. NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

4. During the 1987 Fall Term, did this institution consider you to be employed here full-time or part-time?

Full-time 1

Part-time 2

5. During the 1987 Fall Term, were you employed only at this institution, or did you also have other employment? *Please include outside consulting or other self-owned business.*

Employed only at this institution . . . . . 1 --> SKIP TO Q.7

Also had other employment or consulting . . 2

6. Other than this institution, in which of the following ways were you employed during the 1987 Fall Term?
(PLEASE CIRCLE "FULL-TIME" OR "PART-TIME" FOR ALL SECTORS THAT APPLY)

	TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT	
Employment sector	Full-time (35+ hours/week)	Part-time (<35 hours/week)
Consulting, freelance work, or self-owned business in area directly related to my field at this institution	1	2
Consulting, freelance work, or self-owned business in area largely unrelated to my field at this institution	1	2
On staff of another postsecondary educational institution	1	2
On staff of an elementary or secondary school	1	2
On staff of a hospital or other health care/ clinical setting	1	2
On staff of a foundation or other nonprofit organization	1	2
On staff of a for-profit business or industry in the private sector	1	2
On staff of the federal government (including military)	1	2
On staff of a state or local government	1	2
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW:) ____________________	1	2

7. Were you chairperson of a department or division at this institution during the 1987 Fall Term?

Yes 1

No 2

8. During the 1987 Fall Term, were you on sabbatical from this institution?

Yes 1

No 2

9. What was your tenure status at this institution during the 1987 Fall Term?

Not applicable: no tenure system at this institution 1

Not applicable: no tenure system for my faculty status 2

Not on tenure track 3

On tenure track but not tenured . . 4

(1–4: SKIP TO Q.11)

Tenured 5

10. In what year did you achieve tenure at this institution?
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF NOT SURE)

19_____

PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 12

11. During the 1987 Fall Term, what was the duration of your contract or appointment at this institution?

One academic term 1

One academic/calendar year 2

Two or more academic/calendar years . 3

Unspecified duration 4

Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW) 5

____

12. Which of the following best describes your academic rank at this institution during the 1987 Fall Term?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Not applicable: no ranks designated at this institution	0 —> SKIP TO Q.14
Distinguished/Named Professor . . .	1
Professor	2
Associate Professor	3
Assistant Professor	4
Instructor	5
Lecturer	6
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)	7

____

13. In what year did you first achieve this rank?
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF NOT SURE)

19____

14. During the 1987 Fall Term, did you hold any of the following kinds of appointments at this institution?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Acting	1
Affiliate or adjunct	2
Visiting	3
Assigned by religious order	4
No, none of the above	0

15. Have you ever achieved tenure at another institution?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY THE YEAR TENURE FIRST ACHIEVED, IF APPLICABLE)

Yes	1 (YEAR FIRST ACHIEVED: 19____)
No	2

16. What is your principal field or discipline of teaching?

(PLEASE REFER TO THE LIST OF FIELDS OF STUDY ON PAGES 24-25 AND ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE NUMBER(S) BELOW)

Field code of my discipline: ______

17. Are any faculty at this institution legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining?

Yes 1
No . . . . 2 } SKIP TO Q.19
Don't know . . . . 9 }

18. Are you a member of the union (or other bargaining association) that represents faculty at this institution?

Yes 1
No 2

B. JOB SATISFACTION ISSUES

19. How satisfied or dissatisfied do *you personally* feel about each of the following aspects of your job at this institution?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	DISSATISFIED		SATISFIED		Does not
	Very	Somewhat	Somewhat	Very	apply
My work load	1	2	3	4	0
My job security	1	2	3	4	0
The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach	1	2	3	4	0
The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach	1	2	3	4	0
The authority I have to make decisions about other (noninstructional) aspects of my job	1	2	3	4	0
The mix of teaching, research, administration, and service (as applicable) that I am required to do	1	2	3	4	0

(continued)

Satisfaction with your job at this institution: (continued)

	DISSATISFIED		SATISFIED		Does not
	Very	Somewhat	Somewhat	Very	apply
Opportunity for my advancement in rank at this institution	1	2	3	4	0
Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor, etc.	1	2	3	4	0
Availability of support services and equipment (including clerical support, personal computers, etc.)	1	2	3	4	0
Freedom to do outside consulting	1	2	3	4	0
My salary	1	2	3	4	0
My benefits, generally	1	2	3	4	0
Overall reputation of the institution	1	2	3	4	0
Institutional mission or philosophy	1	2	3	4	0
Quality of leadership in my department/program	1	2	3	4	0
Quality of chief administrative officers at this campus	1	2	3	4	0
Quality of my colleagues in my department/program	1	2	3	4	0
Quality of faculty leadership (e.g., Academic Senate, Faculty Council) at this institution	1	2	3	4	0
Quality of union leadership at this institution	1	2	3	4	0
Relationship between administration and faculty at this institution	1	2	3	4	0
Interdepartmental cooperation at this institution	1	2	3	4	0
Spirit of cooperation among faculty at this institution	1	2	3	4	0
Quality of my research facilities and support	1	2	3	4	0
Quality of undergraduate students whom I have taught here	1	2	3	4	0

(continued)

Satisfaction with your job at this institution: (continued)

	DISSATISFIED		SATISFIED		Does not apply
	Very	Somewhat	Somewhat	Very	
Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here	1	2	3	4	0
Teaching assistance that I receive	1	2	3	4	0
Research assistance that I receive	1	2	3	4	0
Spouse employment opportunities in this geographic area	1	2	3	4	0
My job here, overall	1	2	3	4	0

20. During the next three years, how likely is it that you will leave this job to do the following?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	Not at all likely	Somewhat likely	Very likely
Retire	1	2	3
Seek or accept a (different) part-time job	1	2	3
Seek or accept a (different) full-time job	1	2	3

21. IF you were to leave this job to accept another position, would you want to do more, less, or about the same amount of each of the following as you currently do?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	I WOULD WANT TO DO:		
	More of this	Same amount of this as I do now	Less of this
Research	1	2	3
Teaching	1	2	3
Advising students	1	2	3
Service activities	1	2	3
Administration	1	2	3

22. IF you were to leave this job to accept another position, how important would each of the following be in your decision to accept another position?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
Salary level	1	2	3
Tenure-track/tenured position	1	2	3
Job security	1	2	3
Opportunities for advancement	1	2	3
Benefits	1	2	3
No pressure to publish	1	2	3
Good research facilities and equipment	1	2	3
Good instructional facilities and equipment	1	2	3
Excellent students	1	2	3
Excellent colleagues	1	2	3
Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views	1	2	3
Good job for my spouse	1	2	3
Good geographic location	1	2	3
Good housing	1	2	3
Good environment/schools for my children	1	2	3
A full-time position	1	2	3
A part-time position	1	2	3

23. IF you were to leave your current position, how likely is it that you would do so to:
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	Not at all likely	Somewhat likely	Very likely
a. Return to school as a student	1	2	3
b. Accept employment in:			
doctoral granting university or college	1	2	3
other 4-year university or college	1	2	3
2-year postsecondary institution	1	2	3
less than 2-year postsecondary institution	1	2	3
elementary or secondary school	1	2	3
hospital or other health care organization	1	2	3
consulting, self-owned business, freelancing	1	2	3
foundation or other nonprofit organization	1	2	3
private sector for-profit business or industry	1	2	3
federal government (including military)	1	2	3
state or local government	1	2	3

24. At what age do you think you are most likely to stop teaching at a postsecondary institution?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Under 40	1
40 - 44	2
45 - 49	3
50 - 54	4
55 - 59	5
60 - 64	6
65 - 69	7
70 or older	8
Have no idea	9

25. At what age do you think you are most likely to retire from paid employment?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Under 50 1
50 - 54 2
55 - 59 3
60 - 64 4
65 - 69 5
70 or older . . 6
Have no idea . . 9

C. ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

26. Please list below **each collegiate and graduate degree** that you hold, the name and location of the institution from which you received it, the year you received it, and the Field Code (from pages 24-25) that applies. *Please do not list honorary degrees.*

(PLEASE COMPLETE ALL COLUMNS FOR EACH DEGREE)

Codes for type of degree:

1	Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of at least 1 year but less than 2 years in length
2	Associate's degree or equivalent
3	Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of more than 2 years but less than 4 years in length
4	Bachelor's degree or equivalent
5	Graduate work not resulting in a degree
6	Master's degree or equivalent
7	Doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)
8	Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., L.L.B., etc.)

Degree code	Year received	Field code	Name of institution	City and state/country of institution
______	19_____	_____	____________________	____________________
______	19_____	_____	____________________	____________________
______	19_____	_____	____________________	____________________
______	19_____	_____	____________________	____________________
______	19_____	_____	____________________	____________________
______	19_____	_____	____________________	____________________
______	19_____	_____	____________________	____________________

27. Which of the following undergraduate academic honors or awards, if any, did you receive?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

National academic honor society, such as Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Beta Pi, or other field-specific national honor society	1
Cum laude or honors	2
Magna cum laude or high honors	3
Summa cum laude or highest honors	4
Other undergraduate academic achievement award	5
None of the above	0

28. When you were in graduate school, which of the following, if any, did you receive?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Doesn't apply: did not attend graduate school	0
Teaching assistantship	1
Research assistantship	2
Program or residence hall assistantship	3
Fellowship	4
Scholarship or traineeship	5
Grant	6
G.I. Bill or other veterans' financial aid	7
Loan	8
None of the above	9

29. For each of the jobs that you have held since graduating from college, please indicate in the table below the years that you began and left the job, the employment sector, your primary responsibility, and whether you were employed full-or part-time.

- *Please begin with your current job, and work backward.*
- *Do not list promotions in rank at your current job(s) as different jobs.*
- *Do not include temporary positions or work as a graduate assistant.*
- *Please list each job (other than promotions in rank) separately!*

(PLEASE COMPLETE ALL COLUMNS FOR EACH POSITION; SPECIFY EMPLOYMENT SECTOR AND PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY CODES FROM THE LISTS ON THE FACING PAGE)

	Years job held		Employment sector	Primary responsibility	Full-time	Part-time
	From	To	(ENTER CODE)	(ENTER CODE)	(CIRCLE ONE)	
CURRENT JOB:	19____	present	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2
	19____	19____	______	______	1	2

CODES FOR QUESTION 29

Employment sector codes

01 Graduate-level institution that is not part of a 4-year school (e.g., independent law school)

02 Doctoral granting university or college

03 Other 4-year college or university

04 2-year postsecondary institution

05 Less-than-2-year postsecondary institution

06 Elementary or secondary school

07 Hospital or other health care or clinical setting

08 Consulting, freelance work, or self-owned business in area directly related to my field at this institution

09 Consulting, freelance work, or self-owned business in area largely unrelated to my field at this institution

10 Foundation or other nonprofit organization

11 For-profit business or industry in the private sector

12 Federal government, including military

13 State or local government

14 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)

IF YOU HAD MORE THAN ONE JOB IN THE "OTHER" CATEGORY, PLEASE LIST SEPARATELY AND CODE EMPLOYMENT SECTORS AS "14a," "14b," ETC., IN Q.30.

(a)______________________________

(b)______________________________

(c)______________________________

(d)______________________________

Primary responsibility codes

1 Teaching

2 Administration

3 Technical or research

4 Community/public service

5 Clinical services

6 Other

30. About how many of each of the following have you presented/published/etc. during your entire career and just during the last 2 years? *For publications, please include works that have been accepted for publication.*

(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES IF NOT SURE; IF NONE, CIRCLE "0")

0 No presentations/publications/etc.

	Number in past 2 years	Total during career
Articles or creative works published in refereed professional or trade journals	______	______
Articles or creative works published in nonrefereed professional or trade journals	______	______
Articles or creative works published in juried popular media	______	______
Articles or creative works published in nonjuried popular media or in-house newsletters	______	______
Published reviews of books, articles, or creative works	______	______
Chapters in edited volumes	______	______
Textbooks	______	______
Other books	______	______
Monographs	______	______
Research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients	______	______
Presentations at conferences, workshops, etc.	______	______
Exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts	______	______
Patents or copyrights (excluding thesis or dissertation)	______	______
Computer software products	______	______

D. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORKLOAD

31. During the 1987 Fall Term, how many graduate or undergraduate dissertations or theses, comprehensive exams, or orals committees did you chair or serve on at this institution? *(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, ENTER "0")*

	Number served on but did not chair	Number chaired
Thesis or dissertation committees	______	______
Comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees)	______	______

32. For each for-credit class or section that you taught at this institution during the 1987 Fall Term, please indicate below the number of hours per week that the class met; if the class was team taught, please indicate the average number of hours per week that you personally taught it. Next, please indicate the number and primary level of students enrolled; the class' primary setting; and the number of teaching assistants (TA's), readers, etc., who assisted you with the class.

Please do not include noncredit courses that you taught. Also, please do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual (one-on-one) performance classes.

If you taught multiple sections of the same course, please count them as separate classes, but do not include the lab section of a course as a separate class.

Codes for primary level of students:

1 Lower division students (first or second year) in program leading to associate or bachelor's degree

2 Upper division students (juniors or seniors) in program leading to bachelor's degree

3 Graduate students (post-baccalaureate)

4 Students in program leading to certificate or award other than associate, bachelor's, or graduate degree

5 All other students

6 Any combination of the above

Codes for primary setting:

1 Lecture

2 Seminar, discussion group

3 Lab, clinic

4 Fieldwork, field trips

5 Role playing, simulation, or other performance (e.g., art, music, drama)

6 TV, radio, or other distance media

7 Any combination of the above

8 Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW):

(a)____________________________

(b)____________________________

(c)____________________________

Number of hours per week the class met	IF TEAM TAUGHT: Avg. # hours per week you taught the class	Number of students enrolled	Primary level of students (ENTER CODE)	Primary setting (ENTER CODE)	Number of TA's readers, etc.
______	______	______	_____	_____	______
______	______	______	_____	_____	______
______	______	______	_____	_____	______
______	______	______	_____	_____	______
______	______	______	_____	_____	______

33. For each type of student listed below, please indicate how many at this institution received individualized instruction from you during the 1987 Fall Term. Also indicate the total number of contact hours per week that you spent providing individualized instruction to each group.
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES IF NOT SURE; IF NONE, CIRCLE "0")

Provided no individualized instruction 0

	INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION	
Types of students at this institution	Number of students	Total contact hours per week
Lower division students (first or second year) in program leading to associate or bachelor's degree	______	______
Upper division students (juniors, seniors) in program leading to bachelor's degree	______	______
Graduate students (post-baccalaureate)	______	______
Students in program leading to certificate/award other than associate/bachelor's/graduate degree	______	______
All other students	______	______

34. During the 1987 Fall Term, were you a principal investigator or project director on any grants or contracts at this institution, including service contracts or internal awards?

Yes 1

No . . . . . 2 —> SKIP TO Q.36

35. For the grants and contracts for which you were a principal investigator (PI) during the 1987 Fall Term, please indicate below, by source, how many you had and their total dollar amount for the 1987-88 academic year.
If you were/are a principal investigator on a multiple-investigator project, please divide the total dollar amount by the number of PIs on the project.
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE FOR EACH SOURCE; IF NONE, ENTER "0")

Source of funding	Number of grants/contracts	Total funding for the 1987-88 academic year
Federal government	______	$______
State or local government	______	$______
Foundation or other nonprofit	______	$______
For-profit business or industry in the private sector	______	$______
This institution	______	$______
Other source (PLEASE SPECIFY) ______________	______	$______

36. On the average, how many hours per week did you spend at each of the following kinds of work during the 1987 Fall Term?
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES IF NOT SURE)

	Average number hours per week during the 1987 Fall Term
All activities at this institution (teaching, research, administration, etc.)	________
Any other paid activities (e.g., consulting, working on other jobs)	________
Unpaid (*pro bono*) professional service activities	________

37. Please estimate the percentage of your total working hours (i.e., the categories listed in Question 36) that you spent on each of the following activities during the 1987 Fall Term. *(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES IF NOT SURE; IF NONE, ENTER "0")*

Note: The percentages you provide should sum to 100% of the total time you spent on professional activities.	Percent
Working with student organizations or intramural athletics	________
Teaching, advising, or supervising students (other than those activities covered in the above category)	________
Grading papers, preparing courses, developing new curricula, etc.	________
Administrative activities (including paperwork; staff supervision; serving on in-house committees, such as the academic senate; etc.)	________
Research; scholarship; preparing or reviewing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; etc.	________
Giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts, or speeches	________
Seeking outside funding (including proposal writing)	________
Taking courses, pursuing an advanced degree	________
Other professional development activities, such as practice or other activities to remain current in your field	________
Providing legal or medical services or psychological counseling to clients or patients	________
Outside consulting or freelance work, working at self-owned business	________
Paid or unpaid community or public service (civic, religious, etc.)	________
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY:) ________________________________	________
____	________

We know that this is tedious, but please be sure that the above adds to 100%

E . BENEFITS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

38. During the 1987 Fall Term, were the following employee benefits available to you at this institution?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH BENEFIT)

	AVAILABLE TO ME		
	Yes	No	Don't know
Free or subsidized wellness or health promotion program (e.g., fitness or smoking cessation program)	1	2	9
Paid maternity leave	1	2	9
Paid paternity leave	1	2	9
Subsidized medical insurance or medical care	1	2	9
Subsidized dental insurance or dental care	1	2	9
Subsidized disability insurance	1	2	9
Subsidized life insurance	1	2	9
Retirement plan to which institution makes contributions	1	2	9
Retirement plan to which you make contributions but the institution does not	1	2	9
Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1	2	9
Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1	2	9
Subsidized child care	1	2	9
Subsidized housing/mortgage	1	2	9

39. Listed below are some ways that institutions and departments may use internal funds for the professional development of faculty members.

- If a professional development activity was not available to you during the 1987 Fall Term, please circle the "Not Available" code
- If an activity was available to you at this institution during the 1987 Fall Term, please indicate how adequate to your needs the funds available for that purpose were.
- If you do not know whether an activity was available to you, please circle the "Don't Know" code.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

Institutional or departmental funding for:	NOT available to me	AVAILABLE TO ME: INADEQUATE Very	INADEQUATE Somewhat	ADEQUATE Somewhat	ADEQUATE Very	Don't know if this was available
Tuition remission at this or other institutions	0	1	2	3	4	9
Professional association memberships	0	1	2	3	4	9
Registration fees, etc., for workshops, conferences, etc.	0	1	2	3	4	9
Professional travel	0	1	2	3	4	9
Training to improve research skills	0	1	2	3	4	9
Training to improve teaching skills	0	1	2	3	4	9
Retraining for fields in higher demand	0	1	2	3	4	9
Computer equipment	0	1	2	3	4	9

G. COMPENSATION

Note: Your responses on these and all other items in this questionnaire are STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL, will be used only in statistical summaries, and will not be disclosed to your institution or to any individual or group. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be suppressed from the survey files.

40. For the calendar year 1987, please estimate your gross earnings before taxes from each of the sources listed below.

Please do not record any earnings in more than one category.

(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES IF NOT SURE; IF NONE, ENTER "0")

Income from this institution:

Basic salary $__________

Other teaching at this institution not included in basic salary (e.g., for summer session) __________

Supplements not included in basic salary (for administration, research, coaching sports, etc.) __________

Non-monetary compensation (e.g., food, housing, car) *(Please give approximate value)* __________

Any other income from this institution __________

Income from other sources:

Employment at another academic institution __________

Legal or medical services or psychological counseling __________

Outside consulting, consulting business, or freelance work __________

Self-owned business (other than consulting) __________

Professional performances or exhibitions __________

Speaking fees, honoraria __________

Royalties or commissions __________

Any other employment __________

Non-monetary compensation (e.g., food, housing, car) *(Please give approximate value)* __________

Other sources of earned income (PLEASE SPECIFY:)

______________________________ __________

______________________________ __________

G. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

41. Your gender:

Male 1
Female 2

42. In what year were you born? 19______

43. Are you of Hispanic descent--for example, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Cuban, Puerto Rican, etc.?

Yes 1
No 2

44. What is your race? *(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

American Indian, Aleut, Eskimo . . . 1
Asian or Pacific Islander (Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Asian Indian, Korean, Vietnamese, Hawaiian, Guamanian, Samoan, other Asian) . . 2
Black 3
White 4
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW) 5

____

45. What is your current marital status? *(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

Single, never married 1
Married 2
Separated 3
Divorced 4
Widowed 5

46. Of what country are you currently a citizen?

USA 1
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW) . . 2

____

47. What is the highest level of formal education completed by your mother, your father, and your spouse? *(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH PERSON)*

	Mother	Father	Spouse
Don't know/not applicable	0	0	0
Less than high school	1	1	1
High school diploma	2	2	2
Some college	3	3	3
Associate degree	4	4	4
Bachelor's degree	5	5	5
Master's degree	6	6	6
Doctorate or professional degree (e.g., PhD, MD, DVM, JD/LLB)	7	7	7
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)	8	8	8

____

H. ACADEMIC INTERESTS AND VALUES

48. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. *(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)*

	DISAGREE		AGREE	
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly
General issues:				
It is important for faculty to participate in governing their institutions.	1	2	3	4
Faculty promotions should be based at least in part on formal evaluations by students.	1	2	3	4
The tenure system in higher education should be preserved.	1	2	3	4
Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty.	1	2	3	4
Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college faculty.	1	2	3	4
Faculty should be free to present in class any idea they consider relevant.	1	2	3	4
Collective bargaining is likely to bring overall higher salaries and improved benefits for faculty.	1	2	3	4

(continued)

	DISAGREE Strongly	DISAGREE Somewhat	AGREE Somewhat	AGREE Strongly	Does not apply
Private consulting in areas directly related to a faculty member's field of research or teaching should be restricted.	1	2	3	4	
It is important to encourage students to consider a career in higher education.	1	2	3	4	
Institutional Issues:					
The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at this institution.	1	2	3	4	
At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching.	1	2	3	4	0
Female faculty members are treated fairly at this institution.	1	2	3	4	0
Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at this institution.	1	2	3	4	0

49. Please indicate *your opinion* regarding whether each of the following has worsened, improved, or stayed the same in recent years.
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

	Worsened	Stayed the same	Improved	Have no idea
The quality of undergraduate students in higher education	1	2	3	9
The quality of graduate students in my field	1	2	3	9
The quality of students who choose to pursue academic careers in my field	1	2	3	9
The opportunities junior faculty have for advancement in my field	1	2	3	9
The professional competence of individuals entering my academic field	1	2	3	9
Respect for the academic profession, generally	1	2	3	9

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Please return this completed questionnaire in the enclosed franked envelope to:
National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty
SRI International, P.O. Box 2124, Menlo Park, CA 94025-2124

CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

AGRICULTURE

001	Agribusiness & Agricultural Production
002	Agricultural, Animal, Food, & Plant Sciences
003	Renewable Natural Resources, including Conservation, Fishing, & Forestry
004	Other Agriculture

ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

005	Architecture & Environmental Design
006	City, Community, & Regional Planning
007	Interior Design
008	Land Use Management and Reclamation
009	Other Arch. & Environmental Design

ART

010	Art History and Appreciation
011	Crafts
012	Dance
013	Design (other than Arch. or Interior)
014	Dramatic Arts
015	Film Arts
016	Fine Arts
017	Music
018	Music History and Appreciation
019	Other Visual & Performing Arts

BUSINESS

020	Accounting
021	Banking & Finance
022	Business Administration & Management
023	Business Administrative Support (e.g., Bookkeeping, Office Management, Secretarial)
024	Human Resources Development
025	Organizational Behavior
026	Marketing & Distribution
027	Other Business

COMMUNICATIONS

028	Advertising
029	Broadcasting and Journalism
030	Communications Research
031	Communication Technologies
032	Other Communications

COMPUTER SCIENCE

033	Computer & Information Sciences
034	Computer Programming
035	Data Processing
036	Systems Analysis
037	Other Computer Science

EDUCATION

038	Education, General
039	Basic Skills
040	Bilingual/Cross-cultural education
041	Curriculum & Instruction
042	Education Administration
043	Education Evaluation and Research
044	Educational Psychology
045	Special Education
046	Student Counseling & Personnel Svcs.
047	Other Education

Teacher Education

048	Pre-Elementary
049	Elementary
050	Secondary
051	Adult & Continuing
052	Other General Teacher Ed. Programs
053	Teacher Education in Specific Subjects

ENGINEERING

054	Engineering, General
055	Civil Engineering
056	Electrical, Electronics, & Communication Engineering
057	Mechanical Engineering
058	Other Engineering
059	Engineering-Related Technologies

ENGLISH AND LITERATURE

060	English, General
061	Composition and Creative Writing
062	American Literature
063	English Literature
064	Linguistics
065	Speech, Debate, & Forensics
066	English as a Second Language
067	English, Other

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

068	Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, or Other Chinese)
069	French
070	German
071	Italian
072	Latin
073	Japanese
074	Other Asian
075	Russian or Other Slavic
076	Spanish
077	Other Foreign Languages

CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES (continued)

	HEALTH SCIENCES
078	Allied Health Technologies & Services
079	Dentistry
080	Health Services Administration
081	Medicine, including Psychiatry
082	Nursing
083	Pharmacy
084	Public Health
085	Veterinary Medicine
086	Other Health Sciences
087	HOME ECONOMICS
088	INDUSTRIAL ARTS
089	LAW
090	LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCIENCES
	NATURAL SCIENCES
091	Life or Physical Sciences, General
092	Astronomy
093	Biology
094	Botany
095	Chemistry
096	Geological Sciences
097	Physics
098	Physiology
099	Zoology
100	Other Natural Sciences
101	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS
102	MILITARY STUDIES
103	MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
104	PARKS & RECREATION
105	PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, & THEOLOGY
106	PSYCHOLOGY
107	PROTECTIVE SERVICES (e.g., Criminal Justice, Fire Protection)
108	PUBLIC AFFAIRS (e.g., Community Services, Public Administration, Public Works, Social Work)
109	SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES

	SOCIAL SCIENCES
110	Social Sciences, General
111	Anthropology
112	Archeology
113	Area & Ethnic Studies
114	Demography
115	Economics
116	Geography
117	History
118	International Relations
119	Political Science & Government
120	Sociology
121	Other Social Sciences
	VOCATIONAL TRAINING
	Construction Trades
122	Carpentry
123	Electrician
124	Plumbing
125	Other Construction Trades
	Consumer, Personal, & Misc. Services
126	Personal Services (e.g., Barbering, Cosmetology)
127	Other Consumer Services
	Mechanics and Repairers
128	Electrical & Electronics Equipment Repair
129	Heating, Air Conditioning, & Refrigeration Mechanics & Repairers
130	Vehicle & Mobile Equipment Mechanics & Repairers
131	Other Mechanics and Repairers
	Precision Production
132	Drafting
133	Graphic & Print Communications
134	Leatherworking and Upholstering
135	Precision Metal Work
136	Woodworking
137	Other Precision Production Work
	Transportation and Material Moving
138	Air Transportation (e.g., Piloting, Traffic Control, Flight Attendance, Aviation Management)
139	Land Vehicle & Equipment Operation
140	Water Transportation (e.g., Boat and Fishing Operations, Deep Water Diving, Marina Operations, Sailors and Deckhands)
141	Other Transportation and Material Moving
999	OTHER

Appendix C

1988 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire

NATIONAL SURVEY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Institutional Questionnaire

PLEASE READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire was designed to be completed by spokespersons in 2- and 4-year postsecondary institutions of all sizes. Because there is such a wide variety of these institutions, some of the questions may not be worded quite appropriately for your institution. We would appreciate your tolerance of these difficulties.

If your institution has multiple campuses, please answer only for the campus to which the questionnaire was addressed.

If your institution has BOTH lay faculty and those assigned by a religious order, a few questions may require different answers for the two groups. If this occurs, please call Dr. Susan Russell (collect) at 415-859-4164 for instructions on how to proceed. We apologize for any inconvenience this may cause you.

Obtaining counts of different kinds of faculty is an important part of this study. If you cannot provide "hard" data for some of the "numbers" questions, please provide your best estimates.

1. On what type of academic calendar does your institution operate? *(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

Semester	1
Trimester	2
Quarter	3
4 - 1 - 4 calendar	4
Other (PLEASE SPECIFY BELOW)	5

____

PLEASE NOTE: *Many of our questions ask about the status of your institution during the 1987 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on October 15, 1987.*

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

PLEASE READ:

By full-time instructional faculty, we mean those members of your institution's instruction/research staff who are employed full-time (as defined by the institution) and whose regular assignment includes instruction.

Include:

- *Regular full-time instructional faculty.*
- *Those who contribute their services, such as members of religious orders.*
- *Those on sabbatical leave.*
- *Administrators such as department chairs or deans who hold full-time faculty rank and whose regular assignment includes instruction.*

Do not include:

- *Replacements for faculty on sabbatical leave.*
- *Others with adjunct, acting, or visiting appointments.*
- *Faculty on leave without pay.*
- *Teaching assistants.*

2. During the 1987 Fall Term, did your institution have any full-time instructional faculty, as defined above?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes 1

No . . . . 2 —> SKIP TO PAGE 8

*Note: Questions about your full-time instructional faculty are on pages 2 - 7.
Questions about your part-time instructional faculty are on pages 8 - 9.*

3. Does your institution have a tenure system for any of your full-time instructional faculty?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Yes 1

No 2

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

4. During the 1987 Fall Term, how many full-time instructional faculty members did your institution have in each of the categories below?

If there are no academic ranks at your institution, please complete only the line for "other full-time instructional faculty."

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

Professor: ________

Associate Professor: ________

Assistant Professor: ________

Instructor: ________

Lecturer: ________

Other full-time instructional faculty, including those with no academic ranks: ________

TOTAL FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY DURING 1987 FALL TERM: ________

5. During the 1987 Fall Term, how many full-time instructional faculty with visiting, acting, or adjunct appointments did your institution have? *Note: These individuals should not appear in your other counts of full-time instructional faculty provided in this questionnaire.*

(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF "HARD" DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE)

____

6. How many full-time instructional faculty did your institution have in each of the following categories?

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

Number on the staff during the 1986 Fall Term: ________
(NOTE: Nineteen eighty-six)

Number who retired between the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term: ________

Number who left the institution between the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term, for reasons other than retirement: ________

Number on the staff at the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term: ________

IF NO TENURE SYSTEM, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 13, ON PAGE 6.

7. During the 1986-87 academic year (i.e., Fall '86 through Spring '87), how many instructional faculty at your institution were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

Number considered for tenure: ________

Number granted tenure: ________

8. During the 1986 and 1987 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track instructional faculty did your institution have?

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

	1986 Fall Term	1987 Fall Term
Tenured instructional faculty:	________	________
Tenure-track (but not tenured) instructional faculty:	________	________

9. How many tenured instructional faculty (if any) left your institution for each of the following reasons between the beginning of the 1986 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1987 Fall Term?

(PLEASE ENTER A NUMBER IN EACH CATEGORY; IF NONE, PLEASE ENTER "0")

Through retirement: ________

To assume another position: ________

Formally removed for cause (e.g, for neglect of duty, incompetence, moral turpitude, fraud, or insubordination): ________

Dismissed because of institutional budget pressures or program closures: ________

For other reasons (e.g., death, disability): ________

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

10. Is there a maximum number of years an instructional faculty member can be on a tenure track and not receive tenure at your institution?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY THE MAXIMUM, IF APPLICABLE)

Yes 1
MAXIMUM: ______

No 2

11. Does your institution currently have an upper limit (either formal or informal) on the percentage of full-time instructional faculty who are tenured?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY PERCENTAGE, IF APPLICABLE)

Yes 1
UPPER LIMIT: ______%

No 2

12. During the past three years, has your institution done any of the following?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY AND SPECIFY NUMBERS, IF APPLICABLE)

Offered optional early or phased retirement . . . 1
NUMBER WHO EXERCISED THIS OPTION IN THE 1986-87 ACADEMIC YEAR: ______

Changed the upper limit on the percentage of full-time faculty who may be tenured 2
PREVIOUS PERCENTAGE: ______

Changed the maximum number of years a person can be on tenure track and not receive tenure . . 3
PREVIOUS MAXIMUM NUMBER OF YEARS: ______

Replaced some tenured or tenure-track positions with fixed-term contract positions 4

Raised the standards for granting tenure or tightened the application of the standards . . . 5

Taken other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured faculty, or having that effect (PLEASE SPECIFY TYPE OF ACTIONS BELOW.) 6

____

None of the above 0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

13. Are any of your full-time instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY PERCENT, IF APPLICABLE)

Yes 1
ABOUT WHAT PERCENT? ______%

No 2

14. Which of the following employee benefits are available to any of your full-time instructional faculty?
(PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

Free or subsidized wellness program or health promotion program (e.g., fitness program, smoking cessation program)	01
Paid maternity leave	02
Paid paternity leave	03
Subsidized medical insurance or medical care	04
Subsidized dental insurance or dental care	05
Subsidized disability insurance	06
Subsidized life insurance	07
Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	08
Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	09
Subsidized child care	10
Subsidized housing/mortgages	11
Free or subsidized meals	12
None of the above	00

15. Please indicate whether each of the retirement plans listed below is available to at least some of your full-time instructional faculty. For those that are available, please specify whether they are subsidized by your institution and the approximate number of full-time instructional faculty who participate in each.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH PLAN AND SPECIFY NUMBERS, AS APPLICABLE)

		AVAILABLE		
	Not available	Subsidized by institution	Not subsidized by institution	Approximate number full-time instructional faculty participants
TIAA/CREF	1	2	3	____
State plan	1	2	3	____
401(k) or 403(b) plan	1	2	3	____
Other retirement plan	1	2	3	____

16. Does your institution have a "cafeteria-style" benefits plan for your full-time instructional faculty? (A cafeteria-style plan is one under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution.)

Yes 1

No 2

17. What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to a full-time instructional faculty member's total benefits package?

______%

PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

PLEASE READ:

By part-time instructional faculty, we mean those members of your institution's instruction/research staff who are employed part-time (as defined by the institution) and whose regular assignment at your institution includes instruction.

Include:

- *Regular part-time instructional faculty.*
- *Those who contribute their services, such as members of religious orders.*
- *Part-time replacements for faculty on sabbatical leave or leave without pay.*
- *Others with part-time adjunct, acting, or visiting appointments.*

Do not include:

- *Faculty on leave without pay.*
- *Teaching assistants.*

18. During the 1987 Fall Term, did your institution have any part-time instructional faculty, as defined above?

Yes 1

No . . . . 2 —> SKIP TO END OF PAGE 9

19. During the 1987 Fall Term, how many part-time instructional faculty did your institution have?
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF "HARD" DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE)

____

20. How many of these part-timers (as indicated in Question 19) had adjunct, acting, or visiting appointments?
(PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IF "HARD" DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE)

____

21. Does your institution have a tenure system for any of your part-time instructional faculty?

Yes 1

No 2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (continued)

22. Are any of your part-time instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining?

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBE. AND SPECIFY PERCENT, IF APPLICABLE)

Yes 1
WHAT PERCENT? ______%

No 2

23. Please indicate whether each of the retirement plans listed below is available to at least some of your part-time instructional faculty. For those that are available, please specify the approximate number of part-time instructional faculty who participate in each.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH PLAN AND SPECIFY NUMBERS, AS APPLICABLE)

		AVAILABLE		
	Not available	Subsidized by institution	Not subsidized by institution	Approximate number part-time instructional faculty participants
TIAA/CREF	1	2	3	______
State plan	1	2	3	______
401(k) or 403(b) plan	1	2	3	______
Other retirement plan	1	2	3	______

24. Does your institution have a "cafeteria-style" benefits plan for your part-time instructional faculty? (A cafeteria-style plan is one under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution.)

Yes 1

No 2

25. What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to part-time instructional faculty members' total benefits package?

______%

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Please return this completed questionnaire in the enclosed franked envelope to:
National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty
SRI International, P.O. Box 2124, Menlo Park, CA 94025-2124

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

1993 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire and Reinterview Questionnaire—Pilot Test

OMB: No. 1850-0608
Expiration Date: 12/93

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

National Center for Education Statistics

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Pilot Test

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

All information on this form will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed or released to your institution or any other group or individual.

Co-sponsored by:	**National Science Foundation** **National Endowment for the Humanities**
Contractor:	**National Opinion Research Center (NORC)** **University of Chicago** **1155 East 60th Street** **Chicago, Illinois 60637** **Toll-Free Number: 1-800-733-NORC**

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY
Instructions for Completing Faculty Questionnaire

Many of our questions ask about your activities during the 1991 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on October 15, 1991.

All questions that ask about your current position or "this" institution refer to your position during the 1991 Fall Term at the institution listed on the label on the back cover of the questionnaire.

This questionnaire was designed to be completed by both full- and part-time instructional and non-instructional faculty in 2- and 4-year postsecondary institutions of all types and sizes. Please read each question carefully and follow all instructions. Some of the questions may not appear to fit your situation precisely; if you have a response other than those listed for a particular question, write in that response.

Most questions ask you to circle a number to indicate your response. Circle the number in front of your response and not the response itself. Other questions ask you to fill in information; write in the information in the space provided.

Please keep track of how long it takes you to fill out the questionnaire and indicate the time on page 27. Mailing instructions for returning the completed questionnaire are also on page 27.

If you have any questions on how to proceed, please call NORC toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC.

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY:
Faculty Questionnaire

1. **During the 1991 Fall Term, did you have any instructional duties at this institution**
* **(e.g., teaching one or more courses, or advising or supervising students' academic activities)?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes **(ANSWER A)** — 2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 2)**

A. **During the 1991 Fall Term, were all or some of your instructional duties related to for-credit courses, or**
* **were all of your instructional duties related to noncredit courses?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. *All* of my instructional duties were related for-credit courses
2. Some of my instructional duties were related to for-credit courses
3. *All* of my instructional duties were related to *non*credit courses
4. Did not teach any courses

2. **What was your principal activity at this institution during the 1991 Fall Term? If you have equal**
* **responsibilities, please select one.**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Technical activities (programmer, technician, etc.)
4. Clinical service
5. Community/public service
6. Administration
   (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ____________________
7. Other (subsidized performer, artist-in-residence, etc.)
8. None of the above; on sabbatical from this institution

3. **During the 1991 Fall Term, did you have faculty status at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No, I did not have faculty status
3. No, no one has faculty status at this institution

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION A. NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

4. **During the 1991 Fall Term, did this institution consider you to be employed here full-time or part-time?**
* *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Full-time
2. Part-time

5. **During the 1991 Fall Term, were you employed only at this institution, or did you also have other employment including any outside consulting or other self-owned business?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Employed only at this institution **(SKIP TO QUESTION 7)**
2. Had other employment or consulting

6. **Other than this institution, were you employed either full-time or part-time in any of the following ways during the 1991 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

Yes: Full-time (35+ hrs/wk)	Yes: Part-time (<35 hrs/wk)	No: Neither full or part-time	Employment sector
1	2	3	a. On staff of a doctoral granting university or college (including professional schools)
1	2	3	b. On staff of a 4-year college or university
1	2	3	c. On staff of a 2-year postsecondary institution
1	2	3	d. On staff of a less than 2-year postsecondary institution
1	2	3	e. On staff of an elementary or secondary school
1	2	3	f. Consulting, doing freelance work, or in a self-owned business
1	2	3	g. On staff of a hospital or other health care/clinical setting
1	2	3	h. On staff of a foundation or other nonprofit organization
1	2	3	i. On staff of a for-profit business or industry in the private sector
1	2	3	j. Federal government employee, including military, or state or local government employee
1	2	3	k. Other *(WRITE IN)* ______________________________

7. **Were you chairperson of a department or division at this institution during the 1991 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No

8. **In what year did you begin your current job at this institution? Include promotions in rank as part of your current job.** *(WRITE IN NUMBER)*
*

19 ☐☐

9. **What was your tenure status at this institution during the 1991 Fall Term?**
* *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Tenured → **In what year did you achieve tenure at this institution?** 19 ☐☐ **(SKIP TO QUESTION 11)**
2. On tenure track but not tenured
3. Not on tenure track
4. Not applicable: no tenure system for my faculty status
5. Not applicable: no tenure system at this institution

10. **During the 1991 Fall Term, what was the duration of your contract or appointment at this institution?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. One academic term
2. One academic/calendar year
3. Two or more academic/calendar years
4. Unspecified duration
5. Other *(WRITE IN)*____

11. **Which of the following best describes your academic rank (title/position) at this institution during the 1991 Fall Term?**
* *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Not applicable: no ranks designated at this institution **(SKIP TO QUESTION 13)**
2. Professor
3. Associate Professor
4. Assistant Professor
5. Instructor
6. Lecturer
7. Other *(WRITE IN)*____

12. **In what year did you first achieve this rank?**
(WRITE IN YEAR)

19 ☐☐

13. **During the 1991 Fall Term, did you hold any of the following kinds of appointments at this institution?**
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. Acting
2. Affiliate or adjunct
3. Visiting
4. Assigned by religious order
5. None of the above

14. **What is your principal field or discipline of teaching?** *(REFER TO THE LIST OF MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY ON PAGES 5 AND 6 AND ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE NUMBER AND NAME BELOW. IF YOU HAVE NO FIELD OF TEACHING, CIRCLE "NA.")*
•

NA. Not Applicable

CODE FOR FIELD OR DISCIPLINE: ________ ______________________________ NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE

15. **What is your principal area of research? If equal areas, select one.** *(IF YOU HAVE NO RESEARCH AREA, CIRCLE "NA.")*
•

NA. Not Applicable

CODE FOR FIELD OR DISCIPLINE: ________ ______________________________ NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE

CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

AGRICULTURE

101	Agribusiness & Agricultural Production
102	Agricultural, Animal, Food, & Plant Sciences
103	Renewable Natural Resources, including Conservation, Fishing, & Forestry
110	Other Agriculture

ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

121	Architecture & Environmental Design
122	City, Community, & Regional Planning
123	Interior Design
124	Land Use Management & Reclamation
130	Other Arch. & Environmental Design

ART

141	Art History & Appreciation
142	Crafts
143	Dance
144	Design (other than Arch. or Interior)
145	Dramatic Arts
146	Film Arts
147	Fine Arts
148	Music
149	Music History & Appreciation
150	Other Visual & Performing Arts

BUSINESS

161	Accounting
162	Banking & Finance
163	Business Administration & Management
164	Business Administrative Support (e.g., Bookkeeping, Office Management, Secretarial)
165	Human Resources Development
166	Organizational Behavior
167	Marketing & Distribution
170	Other Business

COMMUNICATIONS

181	Advertising
182	Broadcasting & Journalism
183	Communications Research
184	Communication Technologies
190	Other Communications

COMPUTER SCIENCE

201	Computer & Information Sciences
202	Computer Programming
203	Data Processing
204	Systems Analysis
210	Other Computer Science

EDUCATION

221	Education, General
222	Basic Skills
223	Bilingual/Cross-cultural Education
224	Curriculum & Instruction
225	Education Administration
226	Education Evaluation & Research
227	Educational Psychology
228	Special Education
229	Student Counseling & Personnel Svcs.
230	Other Education

TEACHER EDUCATION

241	Pre-Elementary
242	Elementary
243	Secondary
244	Adult & Continuing
245	Other General Teacher Ed. Programs
250	Teacher Education in Specific Subjects

ENGINEERING

261	Engineering, General
262	Civil Engineering
263	Electrical, Electronics, & Communication Engineering
264	Mechanical Engineering
265	Chemical Engineering
270	Other Engineering
280	Engineering-Related Technologies

ENGLISH AND LITERATURE

291 English, General
292 Composition & Creative Writing
293 American Literature
294 English Literature
295 Linguistics
296 Speech, Debate, & Forensics
297 English as a Second Language
300 English, Other

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

311 Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, or Other Chinese)
312 French
313 German
314 Italian
315 Latin
316 Japanese
317 Other Asian
318 Russian or Other Slavic
319 Spanish
320 Other Foreign Languages

HEALTH SCIENCES

331 Allied Health Technologies & Services
332 Dentistry
333 Health Services Administration
334 Medicine, including Psychiatry
335 Nursing
336 Pharmacy
337 Public Health
338 Veterinary Medicine
340 Other Health Sciences

350 HOME ECONOMICS

360 INDUSTRIAL ARTS

370 LAW

380 LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCIENCES

NATURAL SCIENCES

391 Life or Physical Sciences, General
392 Astronomy
393 Biology
394 Botany
395 Chemistry
396 Geological Sciences
397 Physics
398 Physiology
399 Zoology
400 Other Natural Sciences

410 MATHEMATICS

420 STATISTICS

430 MILITARY STUDIES

440 MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

450 PARKS & RECREATION

460 PHILOSOPHY

470 RELIGION & THEOLOGY

480 PSYCHOLOGY

490 PROTECTIVE SERVICES (e.g., Criminal Justice, Fire Protection)

500 PUBLIC AFFAIRS (e.g., Community Services, Public Administration, Public Works, Social Work)

510 SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES

SOCIAL SCIENCES

521 Social Sciences, General
522 Anthropology
523 Archeology
524 Area & Ethnic Studies
525 Demography
526 Economics
527 Geography
528 History
529 International Relations
530 Political Science & Government
531 Sociology
540 Other Social Sciences

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

CONSTRUCTION TRADES

601 Carpentry
602 Electrician
603 Plumbing
610 Other Construction Trades

CONSUMER, PERSONAL, & MISC. SERVICES

621 Personal Services (e.g., Barbering, Cosmetology)
630 Other Consumer Services

MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS

641 Electrical & Electronics Equipment Repair
642 Heating, Air Conditioning, & Refrigeration Mechanics & Repairers
643 Vehicle & Mobile Equipment Mechanics & Repairers
644 Other Mechanics & Repairers

PRECISION PRODUCTION

661 Drafting
662 Graphic & Print Communications
663 Leatherworking & Upholstering
664 Precision Metal Work
665 Woodworking
670 Other Precision Production Work

TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIAL MOVING

681 Air Transportation (e.g., Piloting, Traffic Control, Flight Attendance, Aviation Management)
682 Land Vehicle & Equipment Operation
683 Water Transportion (e.g., Boat & Fishing Operations, Deep Water Diving, Marina Operations, Sailors & Deckhands)
690 Other Transportation & Material Moving

900 OTHER *(IF YOU USE THIS CODE, BE SURE TO WRITE IN A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION AT QUESTIONS 14-15, 18 OR 23)*

SECTION B. ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

16. **Which of the following undergraduate academic honors or awards, if any, did you receive?** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*

    1. National academic honor society, such as Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Beta Pi, or other field-specific national honor society
    2. Cum laude or honors
    3. Magna cum laude or high honors
    4. Summa cum laude or highest honors
    5. Other undergraduate academic achievement award
    6. None of the above

17. **When you were in graduate school, which of the following, if any, did you receive?** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*

    1. Doesn't apply: did not attend graduate school
    2. Teaching assistantship
    3. Research assistantship
    4. Program or residence hall assistantship
    5. Fellowship
    6. Scholarship or traineeship
    7. Grant
    8. G.I. Bill or other veterans' financial aid
    9. Federal or state loan
    10. Other loan
    11. None of the above

18. **Please list below each degree or other formal award that you hold, the year you received it, the field code (from pages 5-6) that applies, name of the field, and the name and location of the institution from which you received it. Do not list honorary degrees.** ***(COMPLETE ALL COLUMNS FOR EACH DEGREE)***

CODES FOR TYPE OF DEGREE

1 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of at least 1 year but less than 2 years in length
2 Associate's degree or equivalent
3 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of more than 2 years but less than 4 years in length
4 Bachelor's degree or equivalent
5 Master's degree or equivalent
6 Doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)
7 Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., L.L.B., etc.)

	A. Degree code (see above)	**B. Year received**	**C. Field code (from p. 5-6)**	**D. Name of Field (from p. 5-6)**	**E. Name of Institution and City and State/Country of Institution**
(1st)	____	19____	____	____	____ ____
(2nd)	____	19____	____	____	____ ____
(3rd)	____	19____	____	____	____ ____
(4th)	____	19____	____	____	____ ____
(5th)	____	19____	____	____	____ ____
(6th)	____	19____	____	____	____ ____

19. For the five most recent and significant main jobs that you have held, indicate below the years you began and left
• each job, the employment sector, your primary responsibility, and whether employed full- or part-time.

- Do not count your current position at this institution.
- Do not list promotions in rank at one place of employment as different jobs.
- Do not include temporary positions or work as a graduate student.
- List each job (other than promotion in rank) separately.

A. YEARS JOB HELD	*FIRST PREVIOUS MAIN JOB	*SECOND PREVIOUS MAIN JOB	*THIRD PREVIOUS MAIN JOB	FOURTH PREVIOUS MAIN JOB	FIFTH PREVIOUS MAIN JOB
FROM:	19____	19____	19____	19____	19____
TO:	19____	19____	19____	19____	19____
B. EMPLOYMENT SECTOR	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Doctoral granting university or college (including professional schools)	1	1	1	1	1
Other 4-year college or university	2	2	2	2	2
2-year postsecondary institution	3	3	3	3	3
Less-than-2-year postsecondary institution	4	4	4	4	4
Elementary or secondary school	5	5	5	5	5
Consulting, freelance work, or self-owned business	6	6	6	6	6
Hospital or other health care or clinical setting	7	7	7	7	7
Foundation or other nonprofit organization	8	8	8	8	8
For-profit business or industry in the private sector	9	9	9	9	9
Federal government, including military, or state or local government	10	10	10	10	10
Other	11	11	11	11	11
C. PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Teaching	1	1	1	1	1
Research	2	2	2	2	2
Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)	3	3	3	3	3
Clinical service	4	4	4	4	4
Community/public service	5	5	5	5	5
Administration	6	6	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7	7	7
D. FULL-TIME/PART-TIME	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Full-time	1	1	1	1	1
Part-time	2	2	2	2	2

20. About how many of each of the following have you presented/published/etc. during the last 2 years and during your entire career? For publications, please include only works that have been accepted for publication. Do not count multiple presentations/publications of the same work more than once.
(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES. CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU HAVE NOT PUBLISHED OR PRESENTED.)

NA. No presentations/publications/etc. **(GO TO QUESTION 21)**

A. Number in past 2 years	**B.** Total during career	
______	______	a. Articles published in refereed professional or trade journals
______	______	b. Articles published in nonrefereed professional or trade journals
______	______	c. Creative works published in juried media
______	______	d. Creative works published in nonjuried media or in-house newsletters
______	______	e. Published reviews of books, articles, or creative works
______	______	f. Chapters in edited volumes
______	______	g. Textbooks
______	______	h. Other books
______	______	i. Monographs
______	______	j. Research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients
______	______	k. Presentations at conferences, workshops, etc.
______	______	l. Exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts
______	______	m. Patents or copyrights (excluding thesis or dissertation)
______	______	n. Computer software products

SECTION C. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORKLOAD

21. During the 1991 Fall Term, how many undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation committees, comprehensive exams, orals committees, or examination or certification committees did you serve on or chair at this institution?
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

UNDERGRADUATE			GRADUATE	
A. Number served on but did not chair	**B.** Number chaired		**C.** Number served on but did not chair	**D.** Number chaired
______	______	a. Thesis or dissertation committees	______	______
______	______	b. Comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees)	______	______
______	______	c. Examination/certification committees	______	______

22. During the 1991 Fall Term, what was the total number of classes you taught?
(WRITE IN A NUMBER, OR CIRCLE "0.")

______ Number of classes (ANSWER A)

0. No classes taught **(SKIP TO QUESTION 27)**

A. How many of those classes were for credit? *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

______ Number of for-credit classes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

23. • For each for-credit class or section that you taught at this institution during the 1991 Fall Term, please answer the following items. Do not include noncredit courses or individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual one-on-one performance classes.

If you taught multiple sections of the same course, count them as separate classes, but do not include the lab section of the course as a separate class. For each class, enter the code for the academic discipline of the class. (Refer to pages 5-6 for the codes.)

	FIRST CLASS		SECOND CLASS	
A. • **CODE FOR ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF CLASS (from p. 5-6)**	☐		☐	
B. DURING 1991 FALL TERM				
(1) Number of weeks the class met?	______		______	
• (2) Number of hours the class met per week?	______		______	
(3) Number of teaching assistants, readers?	______		______	
• (4) Number of students enrolled?	______		______	
IF TEAM TAUGHT: (5) Average # hours per week *you* taught the class? *(CIRCLE "NA" IF NOT TEAM TAUGHT)*	______	NA	______	NA
C. • **PRIMARY LEVEL OF STUDENTS**	*(CIRCLE ONE)*		*(CIRCLE ONE)*	
Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary) or	1		1	
upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary) or	2		2	
graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students, or	3		3	
all other students?	4		4	
D. INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS USED *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY IN COLUMN D)* **E. Of those methods (circled in column D), which one was the primary instructional method?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER IN COLUMN E)*	(D) All Methods Used	(E) Primary Method Used	(D) All Methods Used	(E) Primary Method Used
Lecture	1	1	1	1
Seminar	2	2	2	2
Discussion group	3	3	3	3
Lab, clinic	4	4	4	4
Field work, field trips	5	5	5	5
Role playing, simulation, or other performance (e.g., art, music, drama)	6	6	6	6
TV, radio, or other distance media	7	7	7	7
Group projects	8	8	8	8
Applied or experiential learning	9	9	9	9
Other	10	10	10	10

THIRD CLASS		FOURTH CLASS		FIFTH CLASS		SIXTH CLASS	
☐		☐		☐		☐	
________ ________ ________ ________ ________ NA		________ ________ ________ ________ ________ NA		________ ________ ________ ________ ________ NA		________ ________ ________ ________ ________ NA	
(CIRCLE ONE) 1 2 3 4		*(CIRCLE ONE)* 1 2 3 4		*(CIRCLE ONE)* 1 2 3 4		*(CIRCLE ONE)* 1 2 3 4	
(D) All Methods Used	**(E) Primary Method Used**	**(D) All Methods Used**	**(E) Primary Method Used**	**(D) All Methods Used**	**(E) Primary Method Used**	**(D) All Methods Used**	**(E) Primary Method Used**
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

24. **For each type of student listed below, please indicate how many students received individual instruction (e.g., independent study or one-on-one instruction, etc.) from you during the 1991 Fall Term, and the total number of contact hours with these students per week. Do not count regularly scheduled office hours.**
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

FORMAL INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION

A. Number of students	B. Total contact hours per week	
______	______	a. Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary)
______	______	b. Upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary)
______	______	c. Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students
______	______	d. All other students

25A. **During the 1991 Fall Term, how many regularly scheduled office hours did you have per week?**
(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

__________ Number of hours per week

25B. **During the 1991 Fall Term, how much informal contact with students did you have each week outside of the classroom? Do not count individual instruction, independent study, etc., or regularly scheduled office hours.**
(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

__________ Number of hours per week

26. **Did you teach any undergraduate courses for credit during the 1991 Fall Term at this institution?**

1. Yes **(ANSWER A)** 2. No **(GO TO QUESTION 27)**

→ A. **In how many of the undergraduate courses that you taught during the 1991 Fall Term did you use . . .**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

None	Some	All	
1	2	3	a. Computer or machine aided instruction?
1	2	3	b. Student-selected topics for course content?
1	2	3	c. Student presentations?
1	2	3	d. Student evaluations of each other's work?
1	2	3	e. Multiple-choice midterm and/or final exam?
1	2	3	f. Essay midterm and/or final exams?
1	2	3	g. Short-answer midterm and/or final exams?
1	2	3	h. Multiple choice and/or short answer quizzes?
1	2	3	i. Weekly essay assignments?
1	2	3	j. Term-research papers?
1	2	3	k. Grading on a curve?
1	2	3	l. Competency-based grading?

27. **During the 1991 Fall Term, were you engaged in any professional research, writing, or creative works?**

1. Yes 2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 33, PAGE 15)**

28. **How would you describe your primary professional research, writing, or creative work in the 1991-92 academic year?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Pure or basic
2. Applied
3. Policy-oriented
4. Literary or expressive
5. Other *(WRITE IN)* ______________________________

29. • **During the 1991 Fall Term, were you engaged in any funded research or creative endeavors? Include any grants, contracts, or institutional awards. Do not include consulting services.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes

2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 32, PAGE 15)**

30. **For the grants and contracts for which you were a principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (Co-PI) during the 1991 Fall Term, fill out the information below for each funding source. If not sure, give your best estimate.**

A. **Number of grants, contracts, or awards from each funding source** *(WRITE IN NUMBER OR CIRCLE "0.")*	**B.** **Work done as . . .** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*	**C.** **Total funds for 1991-92 academic year**	**D.** **How funds were used** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*
(1) Federal Government ☐ → 0. None	1. PI 2. Co-PI	$ ________	1. Research 2. Professional development 3. Program/curriculum development 4. Other ____________
(2) State or local government ☐ → 0. None	1. PI 2. Co-PI	$ ________	1. Research 2. Professional development 3. Program/curriculum development 4. Other ____________
(3) Foundation or other non-profit organization ☐ → 0. None	1. PI 2. Co-PI	$ ________	1. Research 2. Professional development 3. Program/curriculum development 4. Other ____________
(4) For profit business or industry in the private sector ☐ → 0. None	1. PI 2. Co-PI	$ ________	1. Research 2. Professional development 3. Program/curriculum development 4. Other ____________
(5) This institution ☐ → 0. None	1. PI 2. Co-PI	$ ________	1. Research 2. Professional development 3. Program/curriculum development 4. Other ____________
(6) Other source *(WRITE IN)* ☐ → ______________ ______________ 0. None	1. PI 2. Co-PI	$ ________	1. Research 2. Professional development 3. Program/curriculum development 4. Other ____________

31. **During the 1991-92 academic year, how many other faculty, assistants, or other staff are or were supported by this funding?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

NUMBER

______ a. Other faculty

______ b. Post-doctorate fellow/other post-doctoral assistants

______ c. Graduate fellow/research assistants

______ d. Undergraduate research assistants

______ e. Other research assistants

______ f. Other support, including secretarial staff

32. Did you carry a reduced teaching load during the 1991 Fall Term because of any involvement in research, whether funded or not funded?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not applicable

33. Indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements:
(WRITE IN ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)

1	2	3	4
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

_____ a. This institution wants to be recognized for excellence in teaching

_____ b. This institution deserves to be recognized for excellence in teaching

_____ c. This institution wants to be recognized as a major research institution

_____ d. This institution deserves to be recognized as a major research institution

_____ e. The primary research obligation of faculty is to advance knowledge in their field through basic research; all other forms of research are of secondary importance

_____ f. In my department/program, pure/basic research is valued more highly than other more applied forms of research

_____ g. In an academic setting, pure/basic research deserves to be valued more highly than other more applied forms of research

_____ h. Present attempts to establish cooperative research relationships between the corporate and higher education communities deserve strong support

_____ i. This institution wants to be recognized as a primary contributor to local community and economic development

_____ j. This institution deserves to be recognized as a primary contributor to local community and economic development

34. Just to confirm, were you teaching any courses for credit or involved in any research or creative activities at this institution during the 1991 Fall Term, or were you doing something else at this institution?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Teaching, research, or both
2. Something else *(WRITE IN)* ______________________________

____

35. **How would you rate each of the following facilities or resources in general at this institution, and how would you rate each resource available for your own use?** *(WRITE IN ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

1	2	3	4
Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good

A. **Available At This Institution** *(IF NOT AVAILABLE, WRITE IN "NA")*	**B.** **Available For My Own Use** *(IF NOT NEEDED, WRITE IN "NA")*	
________	________	a. Basic research equipment/instruments
________	________	b. Laboratory space
________	________	c. Availability of research assistants
________	________	d. Basic computer facilities
________	________	e. Audio-visual equipment
________	________	f. Classroom space
________	________	g. Classroom equipment
________	________	h. Office space
________	________	i. Secretarial support
________	________	j. Library holdings
________	________	k. Accessibility (rooms, offices, equipment, etc.) for handicapped individuals
________	________	l. Services available for handicapped individuals
________	________	m. Overall quality of research and learning environment
________	________	n. Coverage by other staff for attendance at conferences, seminars, in-service training, etc.

36. **Listed below are some ways that institutions and departments may use internal funds for the professional development of faculty members. For each professional activity listed, please indicate if funding was available to you during the past two years. If available, also indicate if you used any of those funds at this institution, and if those funds were adequate for your purposes.**

A. Was institutional or department funding available for your use during the past two years for . . .		B. Did you use any of those funds at this institution?	C. Were those funds adequate for your purposes?
(1) tuition remission at this or other institutions?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(2) professional association memberships?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(3) registration fees, etc., for workshops, conferences, etc.?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(4) professional travel?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(5) training to improve research skills?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(6) training to improve teaching skills?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(7) retraining for fields in higher demand?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(8) computer equipment?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(9) release time?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(10) sabbatical for research?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(11) sabbatical for professional development?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(12) institutional grants?	1. Yes → → → 2. No 8. Not sure	1. Yes → → → → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No

37. **On the average, how many hours per week did you spend at each of the following kinds of activities during the**
* **1991 Fall Term?** ***(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES)***

Average number hours per week
during the 1991 Fall Term

______________ a. All activities at this institution (teaching, research, administration, etc.)

______________ b. Any other paid activities (e.g., consulting, working on other jobs)

______________ c. Unpaid (pro bono) professional service activities

38. **Please estimate the percentage of your total working hours (i.e., the categories listed in Question 37) that you spent**
• **on each of the following activities during the 1991 Fall Term.**
(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

Fall 1991
Percent of Working
Hours Spent

TEACHING

______% a. Teaching, grading papers, preparing courses

______% b. Developing new curricula

______% c. Advising or supervising students (not counting working with student organizations or intramural athletics)

______% d. Working with student organizations or intramural athletics

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

______% e. Taking courses, pursuing an advanced degree

______% f. Other professional development activities, such as practice or activities to remain current in your field

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

______% g. Research (time spent in activities that will lead to a concrete product, such as an article, grant proposal, software development, etc.)

______% h. Reviewing or preparing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing proposals

______% i. Seeking outside funding (including proposal writing)

______% j. Giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts, or giving speeches

ADMINISTRATIVE/SERVICE/OTHER NON-TEACHING

______% k. Administrative activities (including paperwork, staff supervision, serving on in-house committees such as the academic senate, etc.)

______% l. Providing legal or medical services or psychological counseling to clients or patients

______% m. Outside consulting or freelance work, working at a self-owned business

______% n. Paid or unpaid community or public service (civic, religious, etc.)

______% o. Service to professional societies/associations

______% p. Other *(WRITE IN)* ____

____

100%

PLEASE BE SURE THAT THE PERCENTAGES YOU PROVIDE ADD UP TO 100% OF THE TOTAL TIME YOU SPENT ON PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES.

39. **What percentage of your time would you prefer to spend in each of the following activities?**
(WRITE IN A PERCENTAGE ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0".)

______% a. Teaching

______% b. Professional growth

______% c. Research/scholarship

______% d. Administrative/service/other non-teaching activities

100%

PLEASE BE SURE THAT THE PERCENTAGES YOU PROVIDE ADD UP TO 100% OF THE TOTAL TIME YOU WOULD PREFER TO SPEND ON PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES.

40. Are you a member of the union (or other bargaining association) that represents faculty at this institution?

1. Available, but not eligible
2. Eligible, but not a member
3. Eligible, and a member
4. Not available at this institution

SECTION D. JOB SATISFACTION ISSUES

41. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following aspects of your instructional duties at this institution? *(CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU HAD NO INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES. OTHERWISE, CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM; IF AN ITEM DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, WRITE IN "NA" NEXT TO THE ITEM.)*

NA. No instructional duties **(GO TO QUESTION 42)**

Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	a. The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach
1	2	3	4	b. The authority I have to make decisions about other (non-instructional) aspects of my job.
1	2	3	4	c. The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach
1	2	3	4	d. Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor, etc.
1	2	3	4	e. Quality of undergraduate students whom I have taught here
1	2	3	4	f. Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here
1	2	3	4	g. Teaching assistance that I receive

42. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of your job at this institution? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	a. My work load
1	2	3	4	b. My job security
1	2	3	4	c. Opportunity for my advancement in rank at this institution
1	2	3	4	d. Time available for keeping current in my field
1	2	3	4	e. Freedom to do outside consulting
1	2	3	4	f. My salary
1	2	3	4	g. My benefits, generally
1	2	3	4	h. Quality of my research facilities and support
1	2	3	4	i. Research assistance that I receive
1	2	3	4	j. Spouse or partner employment opportunities in this geographic area

43. During the next three years, how likely is it that you will leave this job to . . .
• *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

Not At All Likely	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely	
1	2	3	a. retire from the labor force?
1	2	3	b. accept a part-time job at a different postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	c. accept a part-time job outside of postsecondary education?
1	2	3	d. accept a full-time job at a different postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	e. accept a full-time job outside of postsecondary education?

44. If you were to leave your current position in academia, to accept another position, in academia, how important would each of the following be in your decision? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	
1	2	3	a. Salary level
1	2	3	b. Tenure-track/tenured position
1	2	3	c. Job security
1	2	3	d. Opportunities for advancement
1	2	3	e. Benefits
1	2	3	f. No pressure to publish
1	2	3	g. Good research facilities and equipment
1	2	3	h. Good instructional facilities and equipment
1	2	3	i. Excellent students
1	2	3	j. Excellent colleagues
1	2	3	k. Institutional mission or philosophy that is compatible with my own views
1	2	3	l. Good job or job opportunities for my spouse or partner
1	2	3	m. Good geographic location
1	2	3	n. Good housing
1	2	3	o. Good environment/schools for my children
1	2	3	p. A full-time position
1	2	3	q. A part-time position
1	2	3	r. Freedom to teach the courses I want
1	2	3	s. Greater opportunity to teach
1	2	3	t. Greater opportunity to do research

45. At what age do you think you are most likely to stop working at a postsecondary institution?
• *(WRITE IN AGE)*

1. _____ Years of age
8. Don't know

46. If you could elect to draw on your retirement and still continue working at your institution on a part-time basis, would you do so? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No
3. Possibly
8. Don't know

47. If an early retirement option were offered to you at your institution, would you take it?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Possibly
8. Don't know

48. Do you plan to continue working at a postsecondary institution after age 70?

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 50)**
8. Don't know **(SKIP TO QUESTION 50)**

49. If you plan to continue working at a postsecondary institution after age 70, how important are each of the following considerations to you in making your decision? *(WRITE IN ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

1	2	3
Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important

_____ a. Financial reasons
_____ b. The wish to continue teaching
_____ c. The wish to continue research/creative endeavors
_____ d. Access to colleagues
_____ e. Access to research facilities
_____ f. Access to research grants
_____ g. Contact with students
_____ h. The wish to maintain a professional title
_____ i. Fear of boredom
_____ j. Other *(WRITE IN)*_______________________

50. At which age do you think you are most likely to retire from paid employment?
(WRITE IN AGE)

1. _____ Years of age
8. Don't know

SECTION E. COMPENSATION

Note: Your responses to these items as with all other items in this questionnaire are voluntary and strictly confidential, will be used only in statistical summaries, and will not be disclosed to your institution or to any individual or group. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be removed from the survey files.

51. For the calendar year 1991, estimate your gross earnings before taxes from each of the sources listed below.
*** Please do not record any earnings in more than one category.**
(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

Income from this institution:

$ __________ a. Basic salary
$ __________ b. Other teaching at this institution not included in basic salary (e.g., for summer session)
$ __________ c. Supplements not included in basic salary (for administration, research, coaching sports, etc.)
$ __________ d. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)
$ __________ e. Any other income from this institution

Income from other sources:

$ __________ f. Employment at another academic institution
$ __________ g. Legal or medical services or psychological counseling
$ __________ h. Outside consulting, consulting business or freelance work
$ __________ i. Self-owned business (other than consulting)
$ __________ j. Professional performances or exhibitions
$ __________ k. Speaking fees, honoraria
$ __________ l. Royalties or commissions
$ __________ m. Any other employment
$ __________ n. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)

Other sources of earned income *(WRITE IN BELOW)*:

$ __________ o. ______________________________
$ __________ p. ______________________________

52. For the calendar year 1991, what was the total combined income of your household?

$ __________ Total combined household income

53. For the calendar year 1991, how many dependents did you have, not including yourself? (A dependent is someone receiving at least half of his or her support from you.)

________ Number of dependents

SECTION F. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

54. Are you . . .
•

1. male, or
2. female?

55. In what month and year were you born?
• *(WRITE IN MONTH AND YEAR)*

☐☐ 19☐☐
MONTH YEAR

56. What is your race? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*
•

1. American Indian or Alaska Native
2. Asian or Pacific Islander **(ANSWER A)** ⟶
3. Black
4. White
5. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

____

A. What is your Asian or Pacific Islander origin? If more than one, circle the one you consider the most important part of your background. *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Chinese
2. Filipino
3. Japanese
4. Korean
5. Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian/Kampuchean, etc.)
6. Pacific Islander
7. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

(SKIP TO QUESTION 58)

57. Are you of Hispanic descent?
• *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes **(ANSWER A)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 58)**

A. What is your Spanish/Hispanic origin? If more than one, circle the one you consider the most important part of your background.

1. Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano
2. Cuban, Cubano
3. Puerto Rican, Puertorriqueno, or Bouricuan
4. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

58. What is your current marital status?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship
4. Separated
5. Divorced
6. Widowed

59. In what country were you born?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. USA
2. Other *(WRITE IN)*____________________________________

60. What is your citizenship status?
* *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. United States citizen, native
2. United States citizen, naturalized
3. Permanent resident of the United States (immigrant visa)

____
COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP

4. Temporary resident of United States (non-immigrant visa)

____
COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP

61. What is the highest level of formal education completed by your mother, your father, and your spouse or partner?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH PERSON, OR CIRCLE "DK" OR "NA" FOR "DON'T KNOW" OR "NOT APPLICABLE")

Mother	Father	Spouse or Partner	
0	0	0	a. Don't know/Not applicable
1	1	1	b. Less than high school diploma
2	2	2	c. High school diploma
3	3	3	d. Some college
4	4	4	e. Associate degree
5	5	5	f. Bachelor's degree
6	6	6	g. Master's degree
7	7	7	h. Doctorate or professional degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., D.V.M., J.D./L.L.B.)
DK	DK	DK/NA	i. Other *(WRITE IN)*________________________

62. What is the main occupation of your spouse or partner? Count full- or part-time work for wages, salary, commission or fees. *(WRITE IN OCCUPATIONAL TITLE)*

NA. No spouse or partner

____
OCCUPATION OF SPOUSE OR PARTNER

SECTION G. ACADEMIC INTERESTS AND VALUES

63. Overall, to what extent do you feel you participate in decision making concerning academic issues and/or program involvement at this institution? *(WRITE IN ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

1	2	3	4
Not At All	Very Little	To Some Extent	To A Great Extent

Extent to which you are involved at this institution	
______________	a. Selection of academic courses and programs
______________	b. Degree requirements
______________	c. Admission standards and retention plans
______________	d. Departmental budgeting
______________	e. Institutional budgeting
______________	f. Departmental policies, including selection of faculty, department chair, and tenuring of faculty
______________	g. Selection of senior academic leadership
______________	h. Representation on Board of Trustees
______________	i. Athletic policies
______________	j. Institutional long-range planning

64. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly	
1	2	3	4	a. Promotion of college teachers should be based at least in part on formal evaluations by students.
1	2	3	4	b. Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of college teachers.
1	2	3	4	c. Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college teachers.
1	2	3	4	d. Expression of ideas in an academic institution should be unconstrained by culture or gender sensitivities.
1	2	3	4	e. Collective bargaining is likely to bring overall higher salaries and improved benefits for faculty.
1	2	3	4	f. The amount of private consulting by faculty should be restricted by the institution.
1	2	3	4	g. It is important to encourage students to consider a career in higher education.
1	2	3	4	h. The administrative function is taking an increasingly heavy share of available resources at this institution.
1	2	3	4	i. At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching.
1	2	3	4	j. This institution has serious financial problems.
1	2	3	4	k. Qualifications should be relaxed in hiring minority faculty at this institution.
1	2	3	4	l. My department/program has had to live with more than its fair share of budget restraints over the past several years.
1	2	3	4	m. Most undergraduates at this institution only do enough to just "get by."
1	2	3	4	n. State mandated assessment requirements will improve the quality of undergraduate education.
1	2	3	4	o. Fully qualified minority faculty should be preferentially hired at this institution.
1	2	3	4	p. There should be preferential hiring for fully qualified female faculty at this institution.
1	2	3	4	q. If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career.
1	2	3	4	r. I am more enthusiastic about my work now than I was when I began my academic career.
1	2	3	4	s. Special consideration in promotion decisions should be given to female faculty.
1	2	3	4	t. Special consideration in promotion decisions should be given to minority faculty.

65. **Please indicate your opinion regarding whether each of the following has worsened, improved, or stayed the same in recent years at this institution.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

Worsened	Stayed the same	Improved	Have no idea	
1	2	3	8	a. The preparedness of entering undergraduate students in higher education
1	2	3	8	b. The preparedness of graduate students in my field
1	2	3	8	c. The quality of students who choose to pursue academic careers in my field
1	2	3	8	d. The opportunities junior faculty have for advancement in my field
1	2	3	8	e. The professional competence of individuals entering my academic field
1	2	3	8	f. The ability of this institution to meet the educational needs of entering students
1	2	3	8	g. The quality of undergraduate education at this institution
1	2	3	8	h. The atmosphere for free expression of ideas

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Please fill in how long it took you to complete the questionnaire.

☐ **minutes**

Return this completed questionnaire in the enclosed prepaid envelope to:

National Opinion Research Center (4552)
University of Chicago
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

GIVING US FEEDBACK ON THE FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Before a questionnaire can be used in a study, it must first be carefully tested to ensure that all of the questions are clear and easily understood by the person completing it. We would like you to provide us with feedback about the questionnaire. Please take some time now to review the questions and your answers.

- If the general meaning of a question was unclear to you, please circle the question number.
- If there were specific words or phrases in a question that did not make sense to you, please circle the words or phrases.
- If any of the answers to a question did not make sense to you, please circle those answers.
- Use the margins next to a question or answer to provide us with your feedback about questions, question wording, or any other problems that you encountered in answering a question. Please be as critical as you like; feel free to use the reverse side of this page for any other comments you have about the questions or the study.

Your help is greatly appreciated. Your feedback will ensure that this questionnaire, and the data derived from it, will be scientifically sound.

LABEL

OMB: No. 1850-0608
Expiration Date: 12/93

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

National Center for Education Statistics

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Pilot Test

FACULTY REINTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

All information on this form will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed or released to your institution or any other group or individual.

Co-sponsored by: National Science Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities

Contractor: National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Toll-Free Number: 1-800-733-NORC

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY:
FACULTY REINTERVIEW

1. **During the 1991 Fall Term, did you have any instructional duties at (INSTITUTION)**
* **such as teaching one or more courses, or advising or supervising students' academic activities?** *(CODE ONE)*

1. Yes (ASK A) 2. No SKIP TO QUESTION 2

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

A. **During the 1991 Fall Term at (INSTITUTION), were all or some of your instructional duties related to**
* **teaching for-credit courses, were all of your instructional duties related to teaching noncredit courses, or did you not teach any courses?** *(CODE ONE)*

1. All of your instructional duties were related to for-credit courses
2. Some of your instructional duties were related to for-credit courses
3. All of your instructional duties were related to noncredit courses
4. Did not teach any courses

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

2. **Now I'm going to read a list of activities. After I read the entire list, please tell me which one was your principal activity at (INSTITUTION) during the 1991 Fall Term. If you had equal responsibilities, please select one.** *(READ CATEGORIES: CODE ONE)*

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Technical activities, such as programmer, technician, etc.
4. Clinical service
5. Community/public service
6. Administration
7. Other, such as subsidized performer, artist-in-residence, etc.
8. On sabbatical from (INSTITUTION)

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

14. What is the name of your principal field or discipline of teaching? *(RECORD VERBATIM)*

NA. NOT APPLICABLE

____
NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

	AGRICULTURE
101	Agribusiness & Agricultural Production
102	Agricultural, Animal, Food, & Plant Sciences
103	Renewable Natural Resources, including Conservation, Fishing, & Forestry
110	Other Agriculture
	ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
121	Architecture & Environmental Design
122	City, Community, & Regional Planning
123	Interior Design
124	Land Use Management & Reclamation
130	Other Arch. & Environmental Design
	ART
141	Art History & Appreciation
142	Crafts
143	Dance
144	Design (other than Arch. or Interior)
145	Dramatic Arts
146	Film Arts
147	Fine Arts
148	Music
149	Music History & Appreciation
150	Other Visual & Performing Arts
	BUSINESS
161	Accounting
162	Banking & Finance
163	Business Administration & Management
164	Business Administrative Support (e.g., Bookkeeping, Office Management, Secretarial)
165	Human Resources Development
166	Organizational Behavior
167	Marketing & Distribution
170	Other Business
	COMMUNICATIONS
181	Advertising
182	Broadcasting & Journalism
183	Communications Research
184	Communication Technologies
190	Other Communications

	COMPUTER SCIENCE
201	Computer & Information Sciences
202	Computer Programming
203	Data Processing
204	Systems Analysis
210	Other Computer Science
	EDUCATION
221	Education, General
222	Basic Skills
223	Bilingual/Cross-cultural Education
224	Curriculum & Instruction
225	Education Administration
226	Education Evaluation & Research
227	Educational Psychology
228	Special Education
229	Student Counseling & Personnel Svcs.
230	Other Education
	TEACHER EDUCATION
241	Pre-Elementary
242	Elementary
243	Secondary
244	Adult & Continuing
245	Other General Teacher Ed. Programs
250	Teacher Education in Specific Subjects
	ENGINEERING
261	Engineering, General
262	Civil Engineering
263	Electrical, Electronics, & Communication Engineering
264	Mechanical Engineering
265	Chemical Engineering
270	Other Engineering
280	Engineering-Related Technologies

	ENGLISH AND LITERATURE
291	English, General
292	Composition & Creative Writing
293	American Literature
294	English Literature
295	Linguistics
296	Speech, Debate, & Forensics
297	English as a Second Language
300	English, Other
	FOREIGN LANGUAGES
311	Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, or Other Chinese)
312	French
313	German
314	Italian
315	Latin
316	Japanese
317	Other Asian
318	Russian or Other Slavic
319	Spanish
320	Other Foreign Languages
	HEALTH SCIENCES
331	Allied Health Technologies & Services
332	Dentistry
333	Health Services Administration
334	Medicine, including Psychiatry
335	Nursing
336	Pharmacy
337	Public Health
338	Veterinary Medicine
340	Other Health Sciences
350	HOME ECONOMICS
360	INDUSTRIAL ARTS
370	LAW
380	LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCIENCES
	NATURAL SCIENCES
391	Life or Physical Sciences, General
392	Astronomy
393	Biology
394	Botany
395	Chemistry
396	Geological Sciences
397	Physics
398	Physiology
399	Zoology
400	Other Natural Sciences
410	MATHEMATICS
420	STATISTICS
430	MILITARY STUDIES
440	MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
450	PARKS & RECREATION
460	PHILOSOPHY
470	RELIGION & THEOLOGY
480	PSYCHOLOGY
490	PROTECTIVE SERVICES (e.g., Criminal Justice, Fire Protection)
500	PUBLIC AFFAIRS (e.g., Community Services, Public Administration, Public Works, Social Work)
510	SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES
	SOCIAL SCIENCES
521	Social Sciences, General
522	Anthropology
523	Archeology
524	Area & Ethnic Studies
525	Demography
526	Economics
527	Geography
528	History
529	International Relations
530	Political Science & Government
531	Sociology
540	Other Social Sciences
	VOCATIONAL TRAINING
	CONSTRUCTION TRADES
601	Carpentry
602	Electrician
603	Plumbing
610	Other Construction Trades
	CONSUMER, PERSONAL, & MISC. SERVICES
621	Personal Services (e.g., Barbering, Cosmetology)
630	Other Consumer Services
	MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS
641	Electrical & Electronics Equipment Repair
642	Heating, Air Conditioning, & Refrigeration Mechanics & Repairers
643	Vehicle & Mobile Equipment Mechanics & Repairers
644	Other Mechanics & Repairers
	PRECISION PRODUCTION
661	Drafting
662	Graphic & Print Communications
663	Leatherworking & Upholstering
664	Precision Metal Work
665	Woodworking
670	Other Precision Production Work
	TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIAL MOVING
681	Air Transportation (e.g., Piloting, Traffic Control, Flight Attendance, Aviation Management)
682	Land Vehicle & Equipment Operation
683	Water Transportion (e.g., Boat & Fishing Operations, Deep Water Diving, Marina Operations, Sailors & Deckhands)
690	Other Transportation & Material Moving
900	OTHER *(IF YOU USE THIS CODE, BE SURE TO WRITE IN A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION AT QUESTIONS 14-15, 18 OR 23)*

18. **Now I'm going to ask about the last degree or other formal award that you hold.**

CODES FOR TYPE OF DEGREE:

1 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of at least 1 year but less than 2 years in length
2 Associate's degree or equivalent
3 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of more than 2 years but less than 4 years in length
4 Bachelor's degree or equivalent
5 Master's degree or equivalent
6 Doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)
7 Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., L.L.B., etc.)

A. Not counting any honorary degree, what was the last degree or award you received? Did you receive (a/an). . . *(READ CATEGORIES; CODE ONE.)*	**B.** In what year did you receive it?	**D.** What was the name of the field in which you received that (degree or award)?	**E.** What was the name of institution and city and state/country of institution [where you received that (degree or award)]?
(LAST) _____	19_____	____________________	____________________
			____________________
			____________________

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

19. Next I'm going to ask about the last significant and main job that you held previous to your current position at (INSTITUTION).

- **Do not give a promotion in rank at one place of employment as a different job.**
- **Do not include a temporary position or work as a graduate student.**

A. What year did you begin and leave your main job previous to your current position at (INSTITUTION)?	**LAST PREVIOUS MAIN JOB**
FROM:	19____
TO:	19____
B. What was the employment sector for that job? Was it (a/an) . . . *(READ CATEGORIES AND CODE ONE)*	***(CODE ONE)***
Doctoral degree granting university or college, including professional schools	1
Other 4-year college or university	2
2-year postsecondary institution	3
Less-than-2-year postsecondary institution	4
Elementary or secondary school	5
Hospital or other health care or clinical setting	6
Consulting, freelance work, or self-owned business	7
Foundation or other nonprofit organization	8
For-profit business or industry in the private sector	9
Federal government position, including military, or state or local government	10
Other place	11

A. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

B. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

20. **The next question is about articles you have published; and reports, presentations, exhibitions, or performances you have given. For publications, please include only works that have been accepted for publication. Do not count multiple presentations/publications of the same work more than once.** *(READ CATEGORIES, THEN ASK FOR TOTALS.)* **(First/next) . . .** *(ENTER A NUMBER OR "0" FOR EACH CATEGORY.)*

A. How many (a/k/l) in the past 2 years?	**B.** How many total (a/k/l) during your career?	
_______	_______	a. articles have you published in refereed professional or trade journals
_______	_______	k. presentations at conferences, workshops, etc have you made
_______	_______	l. exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts have you given

a. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

k. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

l. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

22. **During the 1991 Fall Term, what was the total number of classes you taught at (INSTITUTION)?** *(ENTER A NUMBER OR "0." IF "0" ENTERED, SKIP TO QUESTION 29. OTHERWISE, ASK A.)*

_____ Number of classes

A. How many of those classes were for-credit?

_____ Number of for-credit classes?

22. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

22A. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

257

23. The next questions ask about each for-credit class or section that you taught at (INSTITUTION) during the 1991 • Fall Term. Do not include noncredit courses or individualized instruction, such as independent study, or individual one-on-one performance classes.

If you taught multiple sections of the same course, count them as separate classes, but do not include the lab section of the course as a separate class. For each class, tell me the name for the academic discipline of the class.

	FIRST CLASS	SECOND CLASS
A. (During the 1991 Fall Term) what was the name of the • academic discipline for the (first/next) class?	________ ________	________ ________
B. (2) How many hours did that class meet per week? •	________	________
(4) How many students were enrolled in that class? •	________	________
C. In that class, what was the primary level of students? • *(READ CATEGORIES AND CODE ONE)*	*(CODE ONE)*	*(CODE ONE)*
Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary)	1	1
Upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary)	2	2
Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students	3	3
Other students	4	4

TOTAL # OF CLASSES

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

B2

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THIRD CLASS	FOURTH CLASS	FIFTH CLASS	SIXTH CLASS
________ ________	________ ________	________ ________	________ ________
______ ______	______ ______	______ ______	______ ______
(CODE ONE) 1 2 3 4	*(CODE ONE)* 1 2 3 4	*(CODE ONE)* 1 2 3 4	*(CODE ONE)* 1 2 3 4

B4

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

C

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

29. **During the 1991 Fall Term, were you engaged in any funded research or creative endeavors? Include any**
• **grants, contracts or institutional awards. Do not include consulting services.**

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 37)**

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:
1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

30. **The next questions are about the grants and contracts for which you were a Principal Investigator, PI, or Co-Principal Investigator, Co-PI, during the 1991 Fall Term.**

A. **How many grants, contracts, or awards were from. . .** *(ENTER NUMBER OR "0.")*		**C.** **What were the total funds for 1991-92 academic year from that source?**
(1) Federal Government	☐ → 0. None	$ __________
(2) State or local government	☐ → 0. None	$ __________
(3) Foundations or other non-profit organizations	☐ → 0. None	$ __________
(4) For-profit business or industry in the private sector	☐ → 0. None	$ __________
(5) (INSTITUTION)	☐ → 0. None	$ __________
(6) Other sources (What were they?) ________________ ________________	☐ → 0. None	$ __________

30(1) CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

30(2) CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

30(3) CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

30(4) CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

30(5) CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

30(6) CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

37. Now I'm going to ask some questions about how you spent your time during the 1991 Fall Term. On the average,
* how many hours per week did you spend in (ACTIVITY) during the 1991 Fall Term?

Average number hours per week during the 1991 Fall Term

____________ a. All activities at (INSTITUTION), including teaching, research, administration, etc.

____________ b. Any other paid activities, such as consulting, working on other jobs

____________ c. Unpaid or pro bono professional service activities

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

38. **The next question is about what percentage of those (Q.37 NUMBER) hours you spent during the 1991 Fall Term in teaching, professional growth, research or scholarship and in non-teaching activities such as administration or service. As I ask you about each activity, make note of the percentage; the numbers you give me for all activities should add up to 100%. (First/Next), I will ask about (four teaching/two professional growth/four research or scholarship/six non-teaching) activities. The different categories are (READ CATEGORIES). What percentage of the (Q.37 NUMBER) hours each week did you spend in. . .** *(READ EACH CATEGORY AND ENTER %. IF NONE, ENTER "0.")*

Fall 1991
Percentage of Working
Hours Spent

TEACHING

______% a. Teaching, grading papers, preparing courses

______% b. Developing new curricula

______% c. Advising or supervising students (not counting working with student organizations or intramural athletics)

______% d. Working with student organizations or intramural athletics

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

______% e. Taking courses, pursuing an advanced degree

______% f. Other professional development activities, such as practice or activities to remain current in your field

RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

______% g. Research, that is time spent in activities that will lead to a concrete product, such as an article, grant proposal, software development, etc.

______% h. Reviewing or preparing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing proposals

______% i. Seeking outside funding, including proposal writing

______% j. Giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts, or giving speeches

ADMINISTRATIVE/SERVICE/OTHER NON-TEACHING

______% k. Administrative activities, including paperwork, staff supervision, serving on in-house committees such as the academic senate, etc.

______% l. Providing legal or medical services or psychological counseling to clients or patients

______% m. Outside consulting or freelance work, working at a self-owned business

______% n. Paid or unpaid community or public service, civic, religious, etc.

______% o. Service to professional societies/associations

______% p. Any other non-teaching activities? (What ______________________________

____

100%

CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

____

The next questions are about compensation.

Your responses on these items, as with all other items in this interview are voluntary and strictly confidential, will be used only in statistical summaries, and will not be disclosed to your institution or to any individual or group. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be removed from the survey files.

51. For the calendar year 1991, estimate your gross earnings before taxes from . . .
* *(READ SOURCES AND ENTER AMOUNT OR "0" FOR EACH.)*

$ __________ a. basic salary from (INSTITUTION)

$ __________ b. outside consulting, consulting business or freelance work

a. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

b. CODE COMPARISON OF RESPONSE WITH RESPONSE IN SAQ OR INITIAL INTERVIEW:

1. MATCH
2. NOT A MATCH (SPECIFY REASON)

____

____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

1993 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire—Pilot Test

OMB: No. 1850-0608
Expiration Date: 12/93

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

National Center for Education Statistics

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Pilot Test

INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

All information on this form will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed or released to your institution or any other group or individual.

Co-sponsored by: National Science Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities

Contractor: National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Toll-Free Number: 1-800-733-NORC

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY
INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

General Instructions

This comprehensive questionnaire was designed to obtain information about full- and part-time instructional personnel as well as non-instructional faculty in 2- and 4-year postsecondary institutions of all types and sizes. Please read each question carefully and follow all instructions. Some of the questions may not appear to fit your institution precisely; if you have a response other than those listed for a particular question, write in that response.

If your institution has multiple campuses, answer only for the campus named in the label on the back of the questionnaire.

If you have any questions about how to proceed if your institution has both lay faculty and those assigned by a religious order, or if you have other questions, please call NORC toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC.

Instructions for Completing the Questionnaire

Section I pertains to instructional faculty and other instructional personnel. Section II asks for information about non-instructional faculty. In both sections, questions should be answered for full-time and part-time personnel. For the questions that ask about minority faculty or other staff, include personnel who are American Indian or Alaska Natives, Asian or Pacific Islander, Black, or Hispanic. For the questions about female faculty or other staff, include persons that have already been counted as minority staff.

Many questions ask about the status of your institution during the 1991 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on October 15, 1991.

Most questions ask you to fill in information; write in the number in the space provided. Other questions ask you to circle a number to indicate your response; circle the number in front of the response, and not the response itself.

Please keep track of who fills out this questionnaire and how long it takes; record that information on pages 17-18. Mailing instructions for the completed questionnaire are on page 17.

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

In this section, we are asking about any personnel at your institution who had instructional duties (e.g., teaching one or more courses, advising students, or supervising students' academic activities) during the 1991 Fall Term.

Include:

- administrative personnel or researchers whose regular assignments include instruction
- permanent and temporary personnel who have any instructional duties, including those who have adjunct, acting, or visiting status
- any instructional personnel on sabbatical leave from your institution

Do not include the following exceptions:

- teaching assistants or post doctoral appointments
- temporary replacements for instructional personnel on sabbatical leave
- instructional personnel on leave without pay
- military personnel who teach only ROTC courses
- instructional personnel teaching outside the U.S. (but not on sabbatical leave)

1. **During the 1991 Fall Term, how many personnel at your institution, as defined above, had any instructional duties? Count both full-time and part-time personnel.** *(WRITE IN NUMBER)*

   ___________ Number of personnel with instructional duties

2. **How many of this number had faculty status during the 1991 Fall Term?** *(WRITE IN NUMBER)*

   ___________ Number of instructional personnel with faculty status

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the following questions about instructional personnel, please answer for both full-time (F/T) and part-time (P/T) personnel. *IF* all instructional personnel have faculty status, fill in only the *"INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY"* columns in this section. *IF* no instructional personnel have faculty status, fill in only the *"OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL"* columns, *OTHERWISE*, fill in all four columns.

3. Please provide the following information about staff changes between the 1990 and 1991 Fall Terms.
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
____	____	(1) Total staff during 1990 Fall Term •	____	____
		(2) Of the total staff, how many were:		
____	____	(a) Minority •	____	____
____	____	(b) Female •	____	____
____	____	(3) • Number who retired between the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term	____	____
		(4) Of the above number, how many were:		
____	____	(a) Minority	____	____
____	____	(b) Female	____	____
____	____	(5) • Number who left for other reasons between the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term	____	____
		(6) Of the above number, how many were:		
____	____	(a) Minority	____	____
____	____	(b) Female	____	____
____	____	(7) • Number of staff at the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term	____	____
		(8) Of the above number, how many were:		
____	____	(a) Minority	____	____
____	____	(b) Female	____	____
____	____	(c) Hired from other academic institutions	____	____
____	____	(d) Hired from non-academic organizations	____	____

4. **How many of each of the following instructional positions did your institution have during the 1991 Fall term? If there are no academic ranks at your institution, complete only line 6 ("other").**
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
____	____	(1) Professor	____	____
____	____	(2) Associate Professor	____	____
____	____	(3) Assistant Professor	____	____
____	____	(4) Lecturer	____	____
____	____	(5) Instructor	____	____
____	____	(6) Other, including those with no academic rank	____	____
TOTAL	TOTAL	(7) Of this total number, how many were:	TOTAL	TOTAL
____	____	(a) Minority	____	____
____	____	(b) Female	____	____

5. **During the 1991 Fall Term, for how many unfilled instructional positions were candidates being actively recruited? Include positions that were temporarily filled by teaching assistants, or by staff with acting, adjunct, or visiting appointments.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
____	____	(1) Total number of unfilled positions	____	____

6. **Does your institution have a tenure system for instructional personnel?**

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 12, PAGE 6)**

7. **During the 1990 and 1991 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track instructional personnel did your institution have?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
____	____	(1) Tenured, 1990 Fall Term	____	____
____	____	(2) Tenure-track but not tenured, 1990 Fall Term	____	____
____	____	(3) Tenured, 1991 Fall Term	____	____
____	____	(4) Tenure-track but not tenured, 1991 Fall Term	____	____

8. **Between the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term, how many tenured instructional personnel (if any) left your institution for each of the following reasons?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
____	____	(1) Through retirement	____	____
____	____	(2) To assume another position	____	____
____	____	(3) For other reasons	____	____

9. **During the 1990-91 academic year (i.e., Fall 1990 through Spring 1991), how many of each staff category at your institution were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
____	____	(1) Number considered for tenure	____	____
		(2) Of the above number, how many were:		
____	____	(a) Minority	____	____
____	____	(b) Female	____	____
____	____	(3) Number granted tenure	____	____
		(4) Of the above number, how many were:		
____	____	(a) Minority	____	____
____	____	(b) Female	____	____

10. **Fill in the following information about the average number of years staff can be on a tenure track, and the upper limit on the percentage who can be tenured in each category.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
____ Yrs	____ Yrs	(1) Maximum number of years staff can be on a tenure track and not receive tenure *(IF NO MAXIMUM, WRITE IN "0")*	____ Yrs	____ Yrs
____ Yrs	____ Yrs	(2) IF MAXIMUM NUMBER OF YEARS HAS CHANGED DURING PAST 3 YEARS, WRITE IN PREVIOUS MAXIMUM *(IF NO CHANGE, WRITE IN "0")*	____ Yrs	____ Yrs
____ %	____ %	(3) Your institution's upper limit (either formal or informal) on the percentage of each category who are tenured *(IF NO UPPER LIMIT, WRITE IN "0")*	____ %	____ %
____ %	____ %	(4) IF UPPER LIMIT ON THE PERCENTAGE HAS CHANGED DURING PAST 3 YEARS, WRITE IN PREVIOUS PERCENTAGE *(IF NO CHANGE, WRITE IN "0")*	____ %	____ %

11. **During the past three years, has your institution done any of the following?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH TYPE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF)

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(1) Replaced some tenured or tenure-track positions with fixed-term contract positions	1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(2) Revised the standards for granting tenure	1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(3) Taken actions designed to lower the percent of tenured staff, or having that effect *(DESCRIBE ANY ACTIONS TAKEN)* A. **Actions affecting F/T faculty:** ____ ____ B. **Actions affecting P/T faculty:** ____ ____ C. **Actions affecting F/T other:** ____ ____ D. **Actions affecting P/T other:** ____ ____	1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No

12. During the past three years, has your institution offered early optional or phased retirement to any instructional personnel? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STAFF CATEGORY)*

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(1) Offered any optional early or phased retirement	1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
_____ # during '90-91 yr	_____ # during '90-91 yr	(2) IF OFFERED, WRITE IN NUMBER WHO EXERCISED THAT OPTION DURING THE 1990-91 ACADEMIC YEAR	_____ # during '90-91 yr	_____ # during '90-91 yr

13. Indicate whether each of the retirement plans listed below is available at your institution to any instructional personnel, available but not subsidized by your institution, or available and subsidized by your institution. For plans that are available (whether or not subsidized), indicate the number of participants from each staff category.

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
		(1) TIAA/CREF:		
1	1	Not available	1	1
2	2	Available, but not subsidized	2	2
3	3	Available and subsidized	3	3
____	____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	____	____
		(2) OTHER 403B PLAN:		
1	1	Not available	1	1
2	2	Available, but not subsidized	2	2
3	3	Available and subsidized	3	3
____	____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	____	____
		(3) STATE PLAN:		
1	1	Not available	1	1
2	2	Available, but not subsidized	2	2
3	3	Available and subsidized	3	3
____	____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	____	____
		(4) 401K OR 401B PLAN:		
1	1	Not available	1	1
2	2	Available, but not subsidized	2	2
3	3	Available and subsidized	3	3
____	____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	____	____
		(5) OTHER RETIREMENT PLAN:		
1	1	Not available	1	1
2	2	Available, but not subsidized	2	2
3	3	Available and subsidized	3	3
____	____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	____	____

14. Which of the following employee benefits are available at your institution to any instructional personnel?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY FOR EACH STAFF CATEGORY)

INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY			OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL	
A.	B.		C.	D.
F/T	P/T		F/T	P/T
1	1	(1) Free or subsidized wellness program or health promotion program (e.g., fitness program, smoking cessation program)	1	1
2	2	(2) Paid maternity leave	2	2
3	3	(3) Paid paternity leave	3	3
4	4	(4) Subsidized medical insurance or medical care	4	4
5	5	(5) Subsidized dental insurance or dental care	5	5
6	6	(6) Subsidized disability insurance program	6	6
7	7	(7) Subsidized life insurance	7	7
8	8	(8) Tuition remission/grants at this or other institution for spouse	8	8
9	9	(9) Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	9	9
10	10	(10) Subsidized child care	10	10
11	11	(11) Subsidized housing/mortgages	11	11
12	12	(12) Free or subsidized meals	12	12
13	13	(13) Medical insurance for retirees	13	13
14	14	(14) "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	14	14
____ %	____ %	(15) WRITE IN THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF SALARY THAT IS CONTRIBUTED BY YOUR INSTITUTION TO EACH CATEGORY'S TOTAL BENEFITS PACKAGE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0".)	____ %	____ %

15. How did your institution use part-time instructional personnel during the 1991 Fall Term?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. to replace full-time instructional personnel on a permanent basis
2. to replace full-time instructional personnel on a temporary basis
3. to complement full-time instructional personnel in certain skill areas

16. Although we have not asked about teaching assistants in the rest of the questionnaire, please answer this question for teaching assistants as well as for other staff. What percentage of undergraduate and graduate instruction, as measured by total student credit hours taught, is carried by each of the following types of staff? (Student credit hours are defined as the number of course credits or contact hours multiplied by the number of students enrolled.)
(WRITE IN A PERCENTAGE ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

A. UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION	B. GRADUATE INSTRUCTION	
_______%	_______%	(1) Teaching assistants
_______%	_______%	(2) Full-time faculty
_______%	_______%	(3) Other full-time staff with instructional duties
_______%	_______%	(4) Part-time faculty
_______%	_______%	(5) Other part-time staff with instructional duties
100%	100%	BE SURE THAT THE PERCENTAGES ADD UP TO 100% OF THE TOTAL CREDIT HOURS TAUGHT IN EACH COLUMN

17. In which of the following ways, if any, is the teaching performance of instructional personnel assessed at this institution?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. Evaluations by students
2. Student test scores
3. Student placement or honors
4. Other measures of student performance
5. Department/division chair evaluations
6. Dean evaluations
7. Peer evaluations
8. Self-evaluations
9. Other *(DESCRIBE)* ____
10. Teaching performance not assessed for instructional personnel

SECTION II: NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

In this section, we are asking about any personnel at your institution who had faculty status, but no instructional duties, during the 1991 Fall Term (e.g., they were neither teaching any courses, advising students, nor supervising students' academic activities).

18. Did your institution have any individuals with faculty status but no instructional responsibilities
*** during the 1991 Fall Term?**

1. Yes
2. No **(PLEASE SKIP TO PAGE 17)**

19. During the 1991 Fall Term, how many personnel at your institution had faculty status but no instructional duties?
*** Count both full-time and part-time personnel.** *(WRITE IN NUMBER)*

__________ Number of faculty with no instructional duties

20. How many of this number were: *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*
*

__________ Administrators

__________ Researchers

__________ Other *(DESCRIBE)* ____

In the following questions about non-instructional faculty, please answer for both full-time (F/T) and part-time (P/T) personnel.

21. Please provide the following information about staff changes between the 1990 and 1991 Fall Terms.
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A.	B.	
F/T	P/T	
_____	_____	(1) Total staff during 1990 Fall Term
		(2) Of the total staff, how many were:
_____	_____	(a) Minority
_____	_____	(b) Female
_____	_____	(3) Number who retired between the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term
		(4) Of the above number, how many were:
_____	_____	(a) Minority
_____	_____	(b) Female
_____	_____	(5) Number who left for other reasons between the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term
		(6) Of the above number, how many were:
_____	_____	(a) Minority
_____	_____	(b) Female
_____	_____	(7) Number of staff at the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term
		(8) Of the above number, how many were:
_____	_____	(a) Minority
_____	_____	(b) Female
_____	_____	(c) Hired from other academic institutions
_____	_____	(d) Hired from non-academic organizations

22. How many of each of the following non-instructional faculty positions did your institution have during the 1991 Fall term? If there are no academic ranks at your institution, complete only line 5 ("other").
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A.	B.	
F/T	P/T	
____	____	(1) Professor
____	____	(2) Associate Professor
____	____	(3) Assistant Professor
____	____	(4) Lecturer
____	____	(5) Other, including those with no academic rank
TOTAL	TOTAL	(6) Of this total number, how many were:
____	____	(a) Minority
____	____	(b) Female

23. Does your institution have a tenure system for non-instructional faculty?

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 28, PAGE 14)**

24. During the 1990 and 1991 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track non-instructional faculty did your institution have? *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")*

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A.	B.	
F/T	P/T	
____	____	(1) Tenured, 1990 Fall Term
____	____	(2) Tenure-track but not tenured, 1990 Fall Term
____	____	(3) Tenured, 1991 Fall Term
____	____	(4) Tenure-track but not tenured, 1991 Fall Term

25. Between the beginning of the 1990 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term, how many tenured non-instructional faculty (if any) left your institution for each of the following reasons?
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A.	B.	
F/T	P/T	
____	____	(1) Through retirement
____	____	(2) To assume another position
____	____	(3) For other reasons

26. During the 1990-91 academic year (i.e., Fall 1990 through Spring 1991), how many non-instructional faculty at your institution were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?
(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0.")

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A.	B.	
F/T	P/T	
____	____	(1) Number considered for tenure
		(2) Of the above number, how many were:
____	____	(a) Minority
____	____	(b) Female
____	____	(3) Number granted tenure
		(4) Of the above number, how many were:
____	____	(a) Minority
____	____	(b) Female

27. **During the past three years, has your institution done any of the following for any non-instructional faculty?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH TYPE OF NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY)*

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A.	B.	
F/T	P/T	
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(1) Replaced some tenured or tenure-track positions with fixed-term contract positions
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(2) Revised the standards for granting tenure
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(3) Taken actions designed to lower the percent of tenured staff, or having that effect *(DESCRIBE ANY ACTIONS TAKEN)* A. **Actions affecting F/T faculty:** ____________________ ____________________ B. **Actions affecting P/T faculty:** ____________________ ____________________

28. **During the past three years, has your institution offered early optional or phased retirement to any non-instructional faculty?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STAFF CATEGORY)*

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A.	B.	
F/T	P/T	
1. Yes 2. No	1. Yes 2. No	(1) Offered any optional early or phased retirement
______ # during '90-91 yr	______ # during '90-91 yr	(2) IF OFFERED, WRITE IN NUMBER WHO EXERCISED THAT OPTION DURING THE 1990-91 ACADEMIC YEAR

29. **Please indicate whether each of the retirement plans listed below is available at your institution for any non-instructiona faculty, available but not subsidized by your institution, or available and subsidized by your institution. For plans that are available (whether or not subsidized), indicate the number of participants from each staff category.**

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
F/T	P/T	
		(1) TIAA/CREF:
1	1	Not available
2	2	Available, but not subsidized
3	3	Available and subsidized
_____	_____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
		(2) OTHER 403B PLAN:
1	1	Not available
2	2	Available, but not subsidized
3	3	Available and subsidized
_____	_____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
		(3) STATE PLAN:
1	1	Not available
2	2	Available, but not subsidized
3	3	Available and subsidized
_____	_____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
		(4) 401K OR 401B PLAN:
1	1	Not available
2	2	Available, but not subsidized
3	3	Available and subsidized
_____	_____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
		(5) OTHER RETIREMENT PLAN:
1	1	Not available
2	2	Available, but not subsidized
3	3	Available and subsidized
_____	_____	(a) IF PLAN AVAILABLE, WRITE IN NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

30. **Which of the following employee benefits are available at your institution to any non-instructional faculty?** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY FOR EACH STAFF CATEGORY)*

NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY		
A. F/T	B. P/T	
1	1	(1) Free or subsidized wellness program or health promotion program (e.g., fitness program, smoking cessation program)
2	2	(2) Paid maternity leave
3	3	(3) Paid paternity leave
4	4	(4) Subsidized medical insurance or medical care
5	5	(5) Subsidized dental insurance or dental care
6	6	(6) Subsidized disability insurance program
7	7	(7) Subsidized life insurance
8	8	(8) Tuition remission/grants at this or other institution for spouse
9	9	(9) Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children
10	10	(10) Subsidized child care
11	11	(11) Subsidized housing/mortgages
12	12	(12) Free or subsidized meals
13	13	(13) Medical insurance for retirees
14	14	(14) "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)
____ %	____ %	(15) WRITE IN THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF SALARY THAT IS CONTRIBUTED BY YOUR INSTITUTION TO EACH CATEGORY'S TOTAL BENEFITS PACKAGE: IF NONE, WRITE IN "0".)

LABEL

PLEASE INDICATE THE TOTAL TIME REQUIRED
TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE:

☐ hours

☐ minutes

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED
PREPAID ENVELOPE TO:

National Opinion Research Center (4552)
University of Chicago
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

NORC
4452
4/92

Please fill in your name and your title at this institution, as well as the names and titles of any other individuals who have answered one or more questions in this questionnaire, and the question numbers each individual worked on. Include telephone numbers in case we have any questions about any entries.

YOUR NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________

PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTIONS #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________

PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTIONS #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________

PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTIONS #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________

PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTIONS #s: ______________________

OTHER NAME: ______________________ TITLE: ______________________

PHONE #: ______________________ QUESTIONS #s: ______________________

Once the answers have been processed, all identifying information, including names and telephone numbers, will no longer be associated with this questionnaire.

GIVING US FEEDBACK ON THE INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Before a questionnaire can be used in a study, it must first be carefully tested to ensure that all of the questions are clear and easily understood by the person completing it. We would like you to provide us with feedback about the questionnaire. Please take some time now to review the questions and your answers.

- If the general meaning of a question was unclear to you, please circle the question number.
- If there were specific words or phrases in a question that did not make sense to you, please circle the words or phrases.
- If any of the response categories to a question did not make sense to you, please circle those categories.
- Use the margins next to a question or answer to provide us with your feedback about questions, question wording, or any other problems that you encountered in answering a question. Please be as critical as you like; feel free to use the back cover for any other comments you have about the questions or the study.

Your help is greatly appreciated. Your feedback will ensure that this questionnaire, and the data derived from it, will be reliable.

LABEL

COMMENTS:

Appendix F

1993 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire

OMB No. 1850-0608
Expiration Date: 12/93

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

National Center for Education Statistics

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

All information on this form will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed or released to your institution or any other group or individual.

Co-sponsored by: National Science Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities

Contractor: National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
Mailing Address:
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615
Toll-Free Number: 1-800-733-NORC

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Instructions for Completing Faculty Questionnaire

Many of our questions ask about your activities during the 1992 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on October 15, 1992.

All questions that ask about your position at "this institution" refer to your position during the 1992 Fall Term ***at the institution listed on the label on the back cover of the questionnaire.***

This questionnaire was designed to be completed by both full-time and part-time instructional faculty and staff, and non-instructional faculty, in 2- and 4-year (and above) higher education institutions of all types and sizes. Please read each question carefully and follow all instructions. Some of the questions may not appear to fit your situation precisely; if you have a response other than those listed for a particular question, write in that response.

Most questions ask you to circle a number to indicate your response. Circle the number in front of your response and not the response itself. Other questions ask you to fill in information; write in the information in the space provided.

Mailing instructions for returning the completed questionnaire are on page 26.

If you have any questions on how to proceed, please call NORC toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC.

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY:
Faculty Questionnaire

1. **During the 1992 Fall Term, did you have any instructional duties at this institution (e.g., teaching one or more courses, or advising or supervising students' academic activities)?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes **(ANSWER 1A)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 2)**

1A. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were . . .** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. *all* of your instructional duties related to credit courses,
2. some of your instructional duties related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit, or
3. *all* of your instructional duties related to *non*credit courses or advising or supervising *non*credit academic activities?

2. **What was your principal activity at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term? If you have equal responsibilities, please select one.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)
4. Clinical service
5. Community/public service
6. Administration
   (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ______________________________
7. On sabbatical from this institution
8. Other (subsidized performer, artist-in-residence, etc.)

3. **During the 1992 Fall Term, did you have faculty status at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No, I did not have faculty status
3. No, no one has faculty status at this institution

SECTION A. NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

4. **During the 1992 Fall Term, did this institution consider you to be employed part-time or full-time?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Part-time **(ANSWER 4A)** 2. Full-time **(SKIP TO QUESTION 5)**

4A. **Did you hold a part-time position at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term because . . .** *(CIRCLE "1" OR "2" FOR EACH REASON)*

Yes	No	
1	2	a. you preferred working on a part-time basis?
1	2	b. a full-time position was not available?
1	2	c. you were supplementing your income from other employment?
1	2	d. you wanted to be part of an academic environment?
1	2	e. you were finishing a graduate degree?
1	2	f. of other reasons?

5. **Were you chairperson of a department or division at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No

6. **In what year did you begin the job you held at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term? Include promotions in rank as part of your Fall 1992 job.** *(WRITE IN YEAR)*

19 ☐ ☐

7. **What was your tenure status at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. **Tenured → 7A. In what year did you achieve tenure at this institution?** 19 ☐ ☐ → **(SKIP TO QUESTION 9)**
2. On tenure track but not tenured
3. Not on tenure track
4. No tenure system for my faculty status
5. No tenure system at this institution

8. **During the 1992 Fall Term, what was the duration of your contract or appointment at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. One academic term
2. One academic/calendar year
3. A limited number of years (i.e., two or more academic/calendar years)
4. Unspecified duration
5. Other

9. **Which of the following best describes your academic rank, title, or position at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER, OR "NA")*

NA. Not applicable: no ranks designated at this institution **(SKIP TO QUESTION 11)**

1. Professor
2. Associate Professor
3. Assistant Professor
4. Instructor
5. Lecturer
6. Other *(WRITE IN)* ______________________________

10. **In what year did you first achieve this rank?**
(WRITE IN YEAR)

19 ☐ ☐

11. **During the 1992 Fall Term, which of the following kinds of appointments did you hold at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*

1. Acting
2. Affiliate or adjunct
3. Visiting
4. Assigned by religious order
5. Clinical
   (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ______________________________
6. Research
   (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ______________________________
7. None of the above

12. **What is your principal field or discipline of teaching?** *(REFER TO THE LIST OF MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY ON PAGES 5 AND 6 AND ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE NUMBER AND NAME BELOW. IF YOU HAVE NO FIELD OF TEACHING, CIRCLE "NA")*

NA. Not Applicable

CODE FOR FIELD OR DISCIPLINE: ________ ________________ NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE

13. **What is your principal area of research? If equal areas, select one.** *(IF YOU HAVE NO RESEARCH AREA, CIRCLE "NA")*

NA. Not Applicable

CODE FOR FIELD OR DISCIPLINE: ________ ________________ NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE

CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

	AGRICULTURE
101	Agribusiness & Agricultural Production
102	Agricultural, Animal, Food, & Plant Sciences
103	Renewable Natural Resources, including Conservation, Fishing, & Forestry
110	Other Agriculture

	ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
121	Architecture & Environmental Design
122	City, Community, & Regional Planning
123	Interior Design
124	Land Use Management & Reclamation
130	Other Arch. & Environmental Design

	ART
141	Art History & Appreciation
142	Crafts
143	Dance
144	Design (other than Arch. or Interior)
145	Dramatic Arts
146	Film Arts
147	Fine Arts
148	Music
149	Music History & Appreciation
150	Other Visual & Performing Arts

	BUSINESS
161	Accounting
162	Banking & Finance
163	Business Administration & Management
164	Business Administrative Support (e.g., Bookkeeping, Office Management, Secretarial)
165	Human Resources Development
166	Organizational Behavior
167	Marketing & Distribution
170	Other Business

	COMMUNICATIONS
181	Advertising
182	Broadcasting & Journalism
183	Communications Research
184	Communication Technologies
190	Other Communications

	COMPUTER SCIENCE
201	Computer & Information Sciences
202	Computer Programming
203	Data Processing
204	Systems Analysis
210	Other Computer Science

	EDUCATION
221	Education, General
222	Basic Skills
223	Bilingual/Cross-cultural Education
224	Curriculum & Instruction
225	Education Administration
226	Education Evaluation & Research
227	Educational Psychology
228	Special Education
229	Student Counseling & Personnel Svcs.
230	Other Education

	TEACHER EDUCATION
241	Pre-Elementary
242	Elementary
243	Secondary
244	Adult & Continuing
245	Other General Teacher Ed. Programs
250	Teacher Education in Specific Subjects

	ENGINEERING
261	Engineering, General
262	Civil Engineering
263	Electrical, Electronics, & Communication Engineering
264	Mechanical Engineering
265	Chemical Engineering
270	Other Engineering
280	Engineering-Related Technologies

	ENGLISH AND LITERATURE
291	English, General
292	Composition & Creative Writing
293	American Literature
294	English Literature
295	Linguistics
296	Speech, Debate, & Forensics
297	English as a Second Language
300	English, Other

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

311 Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, or Other Chinese)
312 French
313 German
314 Italian
315 Latin
316 Japanese
317 Other Asian
318 Russian or Other Slavic
319 Spanish
320 Other Foreign Languages

HEALTH SCIENCES

331 Allied Health Technologies & Services
332 Dentistry
333 Health Services Administration
334 Medicine, including Psychiatry
335 Nursing
336 Pharmacy
337 Public Health
338 Veterinary Medicine
340 Other Health Sciences

350 HOME ECONOMICS

360 INDUSTRIAL ARTS

370 LAW

380 LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCIENCES

NATURAL SCIENCES: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

391 Biochemistry
392 Biology
393 Botany
394 Genetics
395 Immunology
396 Microbiology
397 Physiology
398 Zoology
400 Biological Sciences, Other

NATURAL SCIENCES: PHYSICAL SCIENCES

411 Astronomy
412 Chemistry
413 Physics
414 Earth, Atmosphere, and Oceanographic (Geological Sciences)
420 Physical Sciences, Other

430 MATHEMATICS

440 STATISTICS

450 MILITARY STUDIES

460 MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

470 PARKS & RECREATION

480 PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

490 THEOLOGY

500 PROTECTIVE SERVICES (e.g., Criminal Justice, Fire Protection)

510 PSYCHOLOGY

520 PUBLIC AFFAIRS (e.g., Community Services, Public Administration, Public Works, Social Work)

530 SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY

541 Social Sciences, General
542 Anthropology
543 Archeology
544 Area & Ethnic Studies
545 Demography
546 Economics
547 Geography
548 History
549 International Relations
550 Political Science & Government
551 Sociology
560 Other Social Sciences

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

CONSTRUCTION TRADES

601 Carpentry
602 Electrician
603 Plumbing
610 Other Construction Trades

CONSUMER, PERSONAL, & MISC. SERVICES

621 Personal Services (e.g., Barbering, Cosmetology)
630 Other Consumer Services

MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS

641 Electrical & Electronics Equipment Repair
642 Heating, Air Conditioning, & Refrigeration Mechanics & Repairers
643 Vehicle & Mobile Equipment Mechanics & Repairers
644 Other Mechanics & Repairers

PRECISION PRODUCTION

661 Drafting
662 Graphic & Print Communications
663 Leatherworking & Upholstering
664 Precision Metal Work
665 Woodworking
670 Other Precision Production Work

TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIAL MOVING

681 Air Transportation (e.g., Piloting, Traffic Control, Flight Attendance, Aviation Management)
682 Land Vehicle & Equipment Operation
683 Water Transportation (e.g., Boat & Fishing Operations, Deep Water Diving, Marina Operations, Sailors & Deckhands)
690 Other Transportation & Material Moving

900 OTHER *(IF YOU USE THIS CODE, BE SURE TO WRITE IN A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION AT QUESTIONS 12-13, AND 16)*

SECTION B. ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

14. Which of the following undergraduate academic honors or awards, if any, did you receive?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. National academic honor society, such as Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Beta Pi, or other field-specific national honor society
2. Cum laude or honors
3. Magna cum laude or high honors
4. Summa cum laude or highest honors
5. Other undergraduate academic achievement award
6. None of the above

15. When you were in graduate school, which of the following forms of financial assistance, if any, did you receive?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY, OR CIRCLE "NA")

NA. Not applicable; did not attend graduate school **(GO TO QUESTION 16)**

1. Teaching assistantship
2. Research assistantship
3. Program or residence hall assistantship
4. Fellowship
5. Scholarship or traineeship
6. Grant
7. G.I. Bill or other veterans' financial aid
8. Federal or state loan
9. Other loan
10. None of the above

16. Please list below the degrees or other formal awards that you hold, the year you received each one, the field code (from pages 5-6) that applies, name of the field, and the name and location of the institution from which you received each degree or award. Do not list honorary degrees. *(COMPLETE ALL COLUMNS FOR EACH DEGREE)*

CODES FOR TYPE OF DEGREE

1 Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., L.L.B., etc.)
2 Doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)
3 Master's degree or equivalent
4 Bachelor's degree or equivalent
5 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of more than 2 years but less than 4 years in length
6 Associate's degree or equivalent
7 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of at least 1 year but less than 2 years in length

	A. Degree Code (see above)	**B. Year Received**	**C. Field Code (from pp. 5-6)**	**D. Name of Field (from pp. 5-6)**	**E. Name of Institution (a) and City and State/Country of Institution (b)**
(1) Highest	____	19____	____	____________	a. ____________
				____________	____________
					b. ____________
					____________
(2) Next Highest	____	19____	____	____________	a. ____________
				____________	____________
					b. ____________
					____________
(3) Next Highest	____	19____	____	____________	a. ____________
				____________	____________
					b. ____________
					____________
(4) Next Highest	____	19____	____	____________	a. ____________
				____________	____________
					b. ____________
					____________

17. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you employed only at this institution, or did you also have other employment including any outside consulting or other self-owned business, or private practice?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Employed only at this institution **(SKIP TO QUESTION 19)**
2. Had other employment, consulting, self-owned business, or private practice

→ **17A.** **How many different jobs, other than your employment at this institution, did you have during the 1992 Fall Term? Include all outside consulting, self-owned business, and private practice.** *(WRITE IN NUMBER)*

_____________ Number of Jobs

18. **Not counting any employment at this institution, what was the employment sector of the main other job you held during Fall 1992?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. 4-year college or university, graduate or professional school
2. 2-year or other postsecondary institution
3. Elementary or secondary school
4. Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice
5. Hospital or other health care or clinical setting
6. Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization
7. For-profit business or industry in the private sector
8. Federal government, including military, or state or local government
9. Other *(WRITE IN)* ______________________________________

18A. **What year did you begin that job?**
(WRITE IN YEAR)

19 ☐ ☐

18B. **What was your primary responsibility in that job?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)
4. Clinical service
5. Community/public service
6. Administration
7. Other

18C. **Was that job full-time or part-time?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Full-time
2. Part-time

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

19. **The next questions ask about jobs that ended before the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term. For the three most recent and significant main jobs that you held during the past 15 years, indicate below the year you began and the year you left each job, the employment sector, your primary responsibility, and whether you were employed full-time or part-time.**

- **Do not list promotions in rank at one place of employment as different jobs.**
- **Do not include temporary positions (i.e., summer positions) or work as a graduate student.**
- **List each job (other than promotion in rank) separately.**

If not applicable, circle "NA" ——→	NA	NA	NA
(1) YEARS JOB HELD	A. MOST RECENT MAIN JOB (PRIOR TO FALL 1992)	B. NEXT MOST RECENT MAIN JOB	C. NEXT MOST RECENT MAIN JOB
FROM:	19____	19____	19____
TO:	19____	19____	19____
(2) **EMPLOYMENT SECTOR**	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
4-year college or university, graduate or professional school	1	1	1
2-year or other postsecondary institution	2	2	2
Elementary or secondary school	3	3	3
Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice	4	4	4
Hospital or other health care or clinical setting	5	5	5
Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization	6	6	6
For-profit business or industry in the private sector	7	7	7
Federal government, including military, or state or local government	8	8	8
Other	9	9	9
(3) **PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY**	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Teaching	1	1	1
Research	2	2	2
Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)	3	3	3
Clinical service	4	4	4
Community/public service	5	5	5
Administration	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7
(4) **FULL-TIME/PART-TIME**	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Full-time	1	1	1
Part-time	2	2	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

20. **About how many of each of the following have you presented/published/etc. during your entire career and during the last 2 years? For publications, please include only works that have been accepted for publication. Count multiple presentations/publications of the same work only once.** *(CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU HAVE NOT PUBLISHED OR PRESENTED)*

NA. No presentations/publications/etc. **(GO TO QUESTION 21)**

(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")

Type of Presentation/Publication/etc.	**A. Total during career**	**B. Number in past 2 years**
(1) Articles published in refereed professional or trade journals	______	______
(2) Articles published in nonrefereed professional or trade journals	______	______
(3) Creative works published in juried media	______	______
(4) Creative works published in nonjuried media or in-house newsletters	______	______
(5) Published reviews of books, articles, or creative works	______	______
(6) Chapters in edited volumes	______	______
(7) Textbooks	______	______
(8) Other books	______	______
(9) Monographs	______	______
(10) Research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients	______	______
(11) Presentations at conferences, workshops, etc.	______	______
(12) Exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts	______	______
(13) Patents or copyrights (excluding thesis or dissertation)	______	______
(14) Computer software products	______	______

SECTION C. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORKLOAD

21. **During the 1992 Fall Term, how many undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation committees, comprehensive exams, orals committees, or examination or certification committees did you chair and/or serve on at this institution?** *(CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU DID NOT SERVE ON ANY COMMITTEES)*

NA. Did not serve on any undergraduate or graduate committees **(GO TO QUESTION 22)**

(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")

Type of Committee	A. Number served on	B. Of that number, how many did you chair?
(1) Undergraduate thesis or dissertation committees	______	______
(2) Undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees)	______	______
(3) Undergraduate examination/certification committees	______	______
(4) Graduate thesis or dissertation committees	______	______
(5) Graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees)	______	______
(6) Graduate examination/certification committees	______	______

22. **During the 1992 Fall Term, what was the total number of classes or sections you taught at this institution? Do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual performance classes. Count multiple sections of the same course as a separate class, but not the lab section of a course.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER, OR CIRCLE "0")*

0. No classes taught **(SKIP TO QUESTION 25)**

_____ Number of classes/sections **(ANSWER 22A)**

22A. How many of those classes were classes for credit?

0. No classes for credit **(SKIP TO QUESTION 25)**

_____ Number of classes/sections for credit **(ANSWER QUESTION 23 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**

23. **For each class or section that you taught for credit at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term, please answer the following items. Do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual one-on-one performance classes.**

If you taught multiple sections of the same course, count them as separate classes, but do not include the lab section of the course as a separate class. For each class, enter the code for the academic discipline of the class. (Refer to pages 5-6 for the codes. Please enter the code rather than the course name.)

	A. FIRST FOR-CREDIT CLASS	B. SECOND FOR-CREDIT CLASS
(1) CODE FOR ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF CLASS (from pp. 5-6)	☐	☐
(2) DURING 1992 FALL TERM		
Number of weeks the class met?	a. ______	a. ______
Number of credit hours?	b. ______	b. ______
Number of hours the class met per week?	c. ______	c. ______
Number of teaching assistants, readers?	d. ______	d. ______
Number of students enrolled?	e. ______	e. ______
Was this class team taught?	f. 1. Yes 2. No	f. 1. Yes 2. No
Average # hours per week *you* taught the class?	g. ______	g. ______
(3) PRIMARY LEVEL OF STUDENTS	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary) or	1	1
Upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary) or	2	2
Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students, or	3	3
All other students?	4	4
(4) PRIMARY INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD USED	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Lecture	1	1
Seminar	2	2
Discussion group or class presentations	3	3
Lab, clinic or problem session	4	4
Apprenticeship, internship, field work, or field trips	5	5
Role playing, simulation, or other performance (e.g., art, music, drama)	6	6
TV or radio	7	7
Group projects	8	8
Cooperative learning groups	9	9

C.	D.	E.	
THIRD FOR-CREDIT CLASS	**FOURTH FOR-CREDIT CLASS**	**FIFTH FOR-CREDIT CLASS**	
☐	☐	☐	
a. ________	a. ________	a. ________	**a. Number of weeks the class met**
b. ________	b. ________	b. ________	**b. Number of credit hours**
c. ________	c. ________	c. ________	**c. Number of hours the class met per week**
d. ________	d. ________	d. ________	**d. Number of teaching assistants, readers**
e. ________	e. ________	e. ________	**e. Number of students enrolled**
f. 1. Yes 2. No	f. 1. Yes 2. No	f. 1. Yes 2. No	**f. Was this class team taught**
g. ________	g. ________	g. ________	**g. Average # hours per week *you* taught**
(CIRCLE ONE)	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	
1	1	1	**Lower division students**
2	2	2	**Upper division students**
3	3	3	**Graduate, post-baccalaureate students**
4	4	4	**All other students**
(CIRCLE ONE)	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	
1	1	1	**Lecture**
2	2	2	**Seminar**
3	3	3	**Discussion group or class presentations**
4	4	4	**Lab, clinic or problem session**
5	5	5	**Apprenticeship, internship, etc.**
6	6	6	**Role playing, simulation, performance, etc.**
7	7	7	**TV or radio**
8	8	8	**Group projects**
9	9	9	**Cooperative learning groups**

24. **Did you teach any undergraduate courses for credit during the 1992 Fall Term at this institution?**

1. Yes **(ANSWER 24A)** 2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 25)**

24A. **In how many of the undergraduate courses that you taught for credit during the 1992 Fall Term did you use . . .** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

None	Some	All		
1	2	3	a.	Computational tools or software?
1	2	3	b.	Computer-aided or machine-aided instruction?
1	2	3	c.	Student presentations?
1	2	3	d.	Student evaluations of each other's work?
1	2	3	e.	Multiple-choice midterm and/or final exam?
1	2	3	f.	Essay midterm and/or final exams?
1	2	3	g.	Short-answer midterm and/or final exams?
1	2	3	h.	Term/research papers?
1	2	3	i.	Multiple drafts of written work?
1	2	3	j.	Grading on a curve?
1	2	3	k.	Competency-based grading?

25. **For each type of student listed below, please indicate how many students received individual instruction from you during the 1992 Fall Term, (e.g., independent study or one-on-one instruction, including working with individual students in a clinical or research setting), and the total number of contact hours with these students per week. Do not count regularly scheduled office hours.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

Type of students receiving Formal Individualized Instruction	**A. Number of students**	**B. Total contact hours per week**
(1) Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary)	_______	_______
(2) Upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary)	_______	_______
(3) Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students	_______	_______
(4) All other students	_______	_______

26. **During the 1992 Fall Term, how many regularly scheduled office hours did you have per week?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_________ Number of hours per week

27. **During the 1992 Fall Term, how much informal contact with students did you have each week outside of the classroom? Do not count individual instruction, independent study, etc., or regularly scheduled office hours.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_________ Number of hours per week

28. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you engaged in any professional research, writing, or creative works?**

1. Yes **(ANSWER QUESTION 29)** 2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 34)**

29. **How would you describe your primary professional research, writing, or creative work during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Pure or basic research
2. Applied research
3. Policy-oriented research or analysis
4. Literary or expressive
5. Program/Curriculum design and development
6. Other

30. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you engaged in any funded research or funded creative endeavors? Include any grants, contracts, or institutional awards. Do not include consulting services.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 34)**

31. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you a principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (Co-PI) for any grants or contracts?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 33)**

32. **During the 1992 Fall Term, how many individuals other than yourself were supported by all the grants and contracts for which you were PI or Co-PI?** *(WRITE IN NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

______ Number of individuals

33. **Fill out the information below for each funding source during the 1992 Fall Term. If not sure, give your best estimate.**

A. **Funding source** *(CIRCLE "1" OR "2" FOR EACH SOURCE)*		**B.** **Number of Grants/ Contracts**	**C.** **Work done as...** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*	**D.** **Total funds for 1992-93 academic year**	**E.** **How funds were used** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*
(1) This institution?	1. Yes → 2. No	______	1. PI 2. Co-PI 3. Staff	$ ________	1. Research 2. Program/curriculum development 3. Other
(2) Foundation or other nonprofit organization?	1. Yes → 2. No	______	1. PI 2. Co-PI 3. Staff	$ ________	1. Research 2. Program/curriculum development 3. Other
(3) For profit business or industry in the private sector?	1. Yes → 2. No	______	1. PI 2. Co-PI 3. Staff	$ ________	1. Research 2. Program/curriculum development 3. Other
(4) State or local government?	1. Yes → 2. No	______	1. PI 2. Co-PI 3. Staff	$ ________	1. Research 2. Program/curriculum development 3. Other
(5) Federal Government?	1. Yes → 2. No	______	1. PI 2. Co-PI 3. Staff	$ ________	1. Research 2. Program/curriculum development 3. Other
(6) Other source? *(WRITE IN)* ______________	1. Yes → 2. No	______	1. PI 2. Co-PI 3. Staff	$ ________	1. Research 2. Program/curriculum development 3. Other

34. **How would you rate each of the following facilities or resources at this institution that were available for your own use during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER, OR "NA," ON EACH LINE)*

Not Available/ Not Applicable	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	
NA	1	2	3	4	a. Basic research equipment/instruments
NA	1	2	3	4	b. Laboratory space and supplies
NA	1	2	3	4	c. Availability of research assistants
NA	1	2	3	4	d. Personal computers
MA	1	2	3	4	e. Centralized (main frame) computer facilities
NA	1	2	3	4	f. Computer networks with other institutions
NA	1	2	3	4	g. Audio-visual equipment
NA	1	2	3	4	h. Classroom space
NA	1	2	3	4	i. Office space
NA	1	2	3	4	j. Studio/performance space
NA	1	2	3	4	k. Secretarial support
NA	1	2	3	4	l. Library holdings

35. **Listed below are some ways that institutions and departments may use internal funds for the professional development of faculty.**

A. **Was institutional or department funding available for your use during the past two years for . . .**		**B.** **Did you use any of those funds at this institution?**	**C.** **Were those funds adequate for your purposes?**
(1) tuition remission at this or other institutions?	1. Yes → 2. No DK. Don't know	1. Yes → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(2) professional association memberships and/or registration fees?	1. Yes → 2. No DK. Don't know	1. Yes → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(3) professional travel?	1. Yes → 2. No DK. Don't know	1. Yes → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(4) training to improve research or teaching skills?	1. Yes → 2. No DK. Don't know	1. Yes → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(5) retraining for fields in higher demand?	1. Yes → 2. No DK. Don't know	1. Yes → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No
(6) sabbatical leave?	1. Yes → 2. No DK. Don't know	1. Yes → 2. No	1. Yes 2. No

36. **On the average, how many hours per week did you spend at each of the following kinds of activities during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES)*

Average number hours per week during the 1992 Fall Term

______________ a. All paid activities at this institution (teaching, research, administration, etc.)

______________ b. All unpaid activities at this institution

______________ c. Any other paid activities outside this institution (e.g., consulting, working on other jobs)

______________ d. Unpaid (pro bono) professional service activities outside this institution

37. **In column A, we ask you to allocate your total work time in the Fall of 1992 (as reported in Question 36) into several categories. We realize that they are not mutually exclusive categories (e.g., research may include teaching; preparing a course may be part of professional growth). We ask, however, that you allocate as best you can the proportion of your time spent in activities whose primary focus falls within the indicated categories. In column B, indicate what percentage of your time you would prefer to spend in each of the listed categories.**

A. **% of Work Time Spent**	*(WRITE IN A PERCENTAGE ON EACH LINE.* *IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*	**B.** **% of Work Time Preferred**
_____%	a. **Teaching** (including teaching, grading papers, preparing courses; developing new curricula; advising or supervising students; working with student organizations or intramural athletics)	_____%
_____%	b. **Research/Scholarship** (including research; reviewing or preparing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing proposals; seeking outside funding; giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts, or giving speeches)	_____%
_____%	c. **Professional Growth** (including taking courses, pursuing an advanced degree; other professional development activities, such as practice or activities to remain current in your field)	_____%
_____%	d. **Administration**	_____%
_____%	e. **Outside Consulting or Freelance Work**	_____%
_____%	f. **Service/Other Non-Teaching Activities** (including providing legal or medical services or psychological counseling to clients or patients; paid or unpaid community or public service, service to professional societies/associations; other activities or work not listed in a-e)	_____%
100%	PLEASE BE SURE THAT THE PERCENTAGES YOU PROVIDE ADD UP TO 100% OF THE TOTAL TIME.	100%

38. **Are you a member of the union (or other bargaining association) that represents faculty at this institution?**

1. Union is available, but I am not eligible
2. I am eligible, but not a member
3. I am eligible, and a member
4. Union is not available at this institution

SECTION D. JOB SATISFACTION ISSUES

39. **How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following aspects of your instructional duties at this institution?** *(CIRCLE "NA" IF YOU HAD NO INSTRUCTIONAL DUTIES)*

NA. No instructional duties **(GO TO QUESTION 40)**

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM; IF AN ITEM DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, WRITE IN "NA" NEXT TO THE ITEM)

Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	a. The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach
1	2	3	4	b. The authority I have to make decisions about other (non-instructional) aspects of my job
1	2	3	4	c. The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach
1	2	3	4	d. Time available for working with students as an advisor, mentor, etc.
1	2	3	4	e. Quality of undergraduate students whom I have taught here
1	2	3	4	f. Quality of graduate students whom I have taught here

40. **How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following aspects of your job at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	a. My work load
1	2	3	4	b. My job security
1	2	3	4	c. Opportunity for advancement in rank at this institution
1	2	3	4	d. Time available for keeping current in my field
1	2	3	4	e. Freedom to do outside consulting
1	2	3	4	f. My salary
1	2	3	4	g. My benefits, generally
1	2	3	4	h. Spouse or partner employment opportunities in this geographic area
1	2	3	4	i. My job here, overall

41. During the next three years, how likely is it that you will leave this job to . . .
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)

Not At All Likely	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely	
1	2	3	a. accept a part-time job at a different postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	b. accept a full-time job at a different postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	c. accept a part-time job not at a postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	d. accept a full-time job not at a postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	e. retire from the labor force?

42. At what age do you think you are most likely to stop working at a postsecondary institution?
(WRITE IN AGE, OR CIRCLE "DK")

_________ Years of age

DK. Don't know

43. If you were to leave your current position in academia to accept another position inside or outside of academia, how important would each of the following be in your decision? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	
1	2	3	a. Salary level
1	2	3	b. Tenure-track/tenured position
1	2	3	c. Job security
1	2	3	d. Opportunities for advancement
1	2	3	e. Benefits
1	2	3	f. No pressure to publish
1	2	3	g. Good research facilities and equipment
1	2	3	h. Good instructional facilities and equipment
1	2	3	i. Good job or job opportunities for my spouse or partner
1	2	3	j. Good geographic location
1	2	3	k. Good environment/schools for my children
1	2	3	l. Greater opportunity to teach
1	2	3	m. Greater opportunity to do research
1	2	3	n. Greater opportunity for administrative responsibilities

44. **If you could elect to draw on your retirement and still continue working at your institution on a part-time basis, would you do so?** *(CIRCLE ONE)*

1. Yes

2. No

DK. Don't know

45. **If an early retirement option were offered to you at your institution, would you take it?** *(CIRCLE ONE)*

1. Yes

2. No

DK. Don't know

46. **At which age do you think you are most likely to retire from all paid employment?** *(WRITE IN AGE, OR CIRCLE "DK")*

________ Years of age

DK. Don't know

SECTION E. COMPENSATION

Note: Your responses to these items as with all other items in this questionnaire are voluntary and strictly confidential. They will be used only in statistical summaries, and will not be disclosed to your institution or to any individual or group. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be removed from the survey files.

47. For the calendar year 1992, estimate your gross compensation before taxes from each of the sources listed below.

(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES; IF NO COMPENSATION FROM A SOURCE, WRITE IN "0")

Compensation from this institution:

$ ________ a. Basic salary ⟶ b. **Type of appointment** (e.g., 9 months) ☐ # of months

$ ________ c. Other teaching at this institution not included in basic salary (e.g., for summer session)

$ ________ d. Supplements not included in basic salary (for administration, research, coaching sports, etc.)

$ ________ e. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)

$ ________ f. Any other income from this institution

Compensation from other sources:

$ ________ g. Employment at another academic institution

$ ________ h. Legal or medical services or psychological counseling

$ ________ i. Outside consulting, consulting business or freelance work

$ ________ j. Self-owned business (other than consulting)

$ ________ k. Professional performances or exhibitions

$ ________ l. Speaking fees, honoraria

$ ________ m. Royalties or commissions

$ ________ n. Any other employment

$ ________ o. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)

Other sources of earned income *(WRITE IN BELOW)*:

$ ________ p. ______________________________

$ ________ q. ______________________________

48. For the calendar year 1992, how many persons were in your household including yourself?

______ Total number in household

49. For the calendar year 1992, what was your total household income?

$ ________ Total household income

50. For the calendar year 1992, how many dependents did you have? Do not include yourself. (A dependent is someone receiving at least half of his or her support from you.)

______ Number of dependents

SECTION F. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

51. Are you . . .

1. male, or
2. female?

52. In what month and year were you born?
(WRITE IN MONTH AND YEAR)

☐ ☐ 19 ☐ ☐
MONTH YEAR

53. What is your race? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
2. Asian or Pacific Islander **(ANSWER 53A)**
3. African American/Black
4. White
5. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

54. Are you of Hispanic descent?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes **(ANSWER 54A)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 55)**

54A. What is your Spanish/Hispanic origin? If more than one, circle the one you consider the most important part of your background.

1. Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano
2. Cuban, Cubano
3. Puerto Rican, Puertorriqueno, or Bouricuan
4. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

55. What is your current marital status?
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship
4. Separated
5. Divorced
6. Widowed

53A. What is your Asian or Pacific Islander origin? If more than one, circle the one you consider the most important part of your background. *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Chinese
2. Filipino
3. Japanese
4. Korean
5. Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian/Kampuchean, etc.)
6. Pacific Islander
7. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

(SKIP TO QUESTION 55)

56. **In what country were you born?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. USA
2. Other *(WRITE IN)*____

57. **What is your citizenship status?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. United States citizen, native
2. United States citizen, naturalized
3. Permanent resident of the United States (immigrant visa)

____
COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP

4. Temporary resident of United States (non-immigrant visa)

____
COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP

58. **What is the highest level of formal education completed by your mother and your father?**
(CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH PERSON)

A. Mother	**B.** Father		
1	1	a.	Less than high school diploma
2	2	b.	High school diploma
3	3	c.	Some college
4	4	d.	Associate's degree
5	5	e.	Bachelor's degree
6	6	f.	Master's degree
7	7	g.	Doctorate or professional degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., D.V.M., J.D./L.L.B.)
8	8	h.	Other
DK	DK	i.	Don't know

59. **Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH STATEMENT)*

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly	
1	2	3	4	a. Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of college teachers at this institution.
1	2	3	4	b. Research/publications should be the primary criterion for promotion of college teachers at this institution.
1	2	3	4	c. At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching.
1	2	3	4	d. State or federally mandated assessment requirements will improve the quality of undergraduate education.
1	2	3	4	e. Female faculty members are treated fairly at this institution.
1	2	3	4	f. Faculty who are members of racial or ethnic minorities are treated fairly at this institution.
1	2	3	4	g. If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career.

60. **Please indicate your opinion regarding whether each of the following has worsened, stayed the same, or improved in recent years at this institution.** *(CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH ITEM)*

Worsened	Stayed the Same	Improved	Don't Know	
1	2	3	DK	a. The quality of students who choose to pursue academic careers in my field
1	2	3	DK	b. The opportunities junior faculty have for advancement in my field
1	2	3	DK	c. The professional competence of individuals entering my academic field
1	2	3	DK	d. The ability of this institution to meet the educational needs of entering students
1	2	3	DK	e. The ability of faculty to obtain external funding
1	2	3	DK	f. Pressure to increase faculty workload at this institution
1	2	3	DK	g. The quality of undergraduate education at this institution
1	2	3	DK	h. The atmosphere for free expression of ideas
1	2	3	DK	i. The quality of research at this institution

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Return this completed questionnaire in the enclosed prepaid envelope to:

National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

RESPONDENT LABEL

Appendix G

1993 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire

OMB: No. 1850-0665
Expiration Date: 3/94

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

National Center for Education Statistics

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

All information on this form will be kept confidential and will be used only in statistical summaries. All information that would permit identification of individuals will be removed from survey files.

Co-sponsored by: National Science Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities

Contractor: National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
Mailing Address:
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615
Toll-Free Number: 1-800-733-NORC

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY (NSOPF)
INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

General Instructions

Obtaining counts of different kinds of faculty/staff is an important part of NSOPF-93. The institution questionnaire seeks information about full- and part-time instructional faculty and other instructional personnel, as well as non-instructional faculty in 2- and 4-year (and above) higher education institutions of all types and sizes. Section I pertains to **full-time instructional faculty/staff**, Section II pertains to **full-time non-instructional faculty**, and Section III pertains to **part-time instructional faculty/staff**. For more information on who to include or exclude in each of the sections of this questionnaire, please refer to the glossary below and/or the introduction at each section. Since we are asking about full- and part-time, and permanent and temporary faculty/staff as defined by your institution, please write in those definitions in the space provided in the glossary.

Most questions ask you to fill in information; write in the number in the space provided. Other questions ask you to circle a number to indicate your response; circle the number in front of the response, and not the response itself. Please read each question carefully and follow all instructions. Some of the questions may not appear to fit your institution precisely; if you have a response other than those listed for a particular question, write in that response.

Many questions ask about the 1992 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on **October 15, 1992**. If your institution has multiple campuses, answer only for the campus named in the label on the back of the questionnaire.

Please keep track of who fills out this questionnaire and fill in this information on page 20. Mailing instructions for the completed questionnaire are also on page 20.

If you have any questions on how to proceed if your institution has both lay faculty and those assigned by a religious order, or if you have other questions, please call NORC toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC.

Glossary

Instructional faculty/staff--All institutional staff (faculty and non-faculty) whose major regular assignment at this institution (more than 50%) is instruction. This corresponds to the IPEDS definition. Individuals do not need to have a dedicated instructional assignment to be included in this category. Be sure to include (1) administrators whose major responsibility is instruction; (2) individuals with major instructional assignments who have temporary, adjunct, acting or visiting status; (3) individuals whose major regular assignment is instruction but who have been granted release time for other institutional activities; and (4) individuals whose major regular assignment is instruction but who are on sabbatical from your institution.

Please do not include: Graduate or undergraduate teaching assistants, postdoctoral appointees, temporary replacements for personnel on sabbatical leave, instructional personnel on leave without pay or teaching outside the U.S., military personnel who teach only ROTC courses, and instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors.

Non-instructional faculty--All institutional staff who have faculty status but would not be included as instructional faculty since their specific and major regular assignment is not instruction but may be for the purpose of conducting research, performing public service, or carrying out administrative functions of the institution.

ON THE NEXT PAGE, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITIONS OF FULL- AND PART-TIME AND PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY FACULTY/STAFF.

Full-time instructional faculty/staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Full-time non-instructional faculty *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Part-time instructional faculty/staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Part-time non-instructional faculty *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Permanent faculty/instructional staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

Temporary faculty/instructional staff *(WRITE IN YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITION)*

PLEASE FILL OUT THE REST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE USING YOUR INSTITUTION'S DEFINITIONS OF FULL- AND PART-TIME AND PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY FACULTY/STAFF. PLEASE REMEMBER THAT THE 1992 FALL TERM IS THE PRIMARY REFERENCE PERIOD.

1. **During the 1992 Fall Term, how many of each of the following types of staff were employed by your institution? Include both permanent and temporary faculty/staff.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

____a. Full-time instructional faculty/staff

____b. Part-time instructional faculty/staff

____c. Full-time non-instructional faculty

____d. Part-time non-instructional faculty

GUIDE TO COMPLETING THE REST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

IF YOUR INSTITUTION HAD ANY FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF, BEGIN WITH SECTION I ON THE NEXT PAGE. IF YOUR INSTITUTION DID NOT HAVE ANY FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF, SKIP TO SECTION II ON PAGE 10.

SECTION I: FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

QUESTIONS 2-14 APPLY TO PERMANENT FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF (REFER TO THE GLOSSARY ON PAGE 1)

QUESTIONS 15-16 APPLY TO TEMPORARY FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

QUESTIONS 17-19 APPLY TO ALL FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

2. **Please provide the following information about changes in the number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff between the 1991 and 1992 Fall Terms.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

____ a. Total permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff during 1992 Fall Term *(IF ALL FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT YOUR INSTITUTION ARE PERMANENT, THIS NUMBER SHOULD EQUAL THE NUMBER REPORTED IN QUESTION 1a, ON PAGE 3)*

____ b. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff at the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term

____ c. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who retired between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

____ d. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who left because of downsizing between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

____ e. Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who left for other reasons between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

____ f. Total permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff during 1991 Fall Term

3. **How many permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff was your institution seeking to hire for the 1992 Fall Term?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

____ Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff

4. **Were any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff positions not filled for the 1992 Fall Term due to fiscal constraints?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ⟶ (A.) ____ Number of unfilled positions *(WRITE IN A NUMBER)*
2. No

5. **Does your institution have a tenure system for full-time instructional faculty/staff?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes **(CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 6 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 11 ON PAGE 6)**

6. **During the 1992 and 1991 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track full-time instructional faculty/staff did your institution have?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Tenured, 1992 Fall Term

_____ b. Tenure-track, 1992 Fall Term

_____ c. Tenured, 1991 Fall Term

_____ d. Tenure-track, 1991 Fall Term

7. **Of those tenured full-time instructional faculty/staff who left your institution between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term, how many left for each of the following reasons?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Retirement

_____ b. Downsizing

_____ c. For other reasons

8. **During the 1992-93 academic year (i.e., Fall 1992 through Spring 1993), how many full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Number of full-time instructional faculty/staff considered for tenure

_____ b. Number of full-time instructional faculty/staff granted tenure

9. **Fill in the following information about the maximum number of years full-time instructional faculty/staff can be on a tenure track.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

_____ Yrs a. Maximum number of years full-time instructional faculty/staff can be on a tenure track and not receive tenure *(IF NO MAXIMUM, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ Yrs b. If maximum number of years has changed during past 5 years, write in previous maximum *(IF NO CHANGE, WRITE IN "0")*

10. **During the past five years, has your institution done any of the following?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ACTION)*

Yes	No		
1	2	a.	Replaced some tenured or tenure-track full-time instructional faculty with faculty on fixed-term contracts
1	2	b.	Made the standards more stringent for granting tenure to full-time instructional faculty/staff
1	2	c.	Taken any other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured full-time instructional faculty/staff *(DESCRIBE ANY ACTIONS TAKEN)*

____

____

11. **During the past five years, has your institution offered early or phased retirement to any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ——▸ (A.) ____ Number of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who took advantage of this offer during the past five years *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*
2. No

12. **Indicate if each of the retirement plans listed below is available to any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution. If available, please indicate whether the plan is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

		(12A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. TIAA/CREF plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Other 403B plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
c. State plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
d. 401K or 401B plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Other retirement plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3

13. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits is available at your institution to any permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

(13A)

		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes ——→ 2. No	1	2	3

14. **What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to the total benefits package for permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff?** *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ %

15. **Are any of the employee benefits listed in Question 13 available to temporary full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR DK)*

1. Yes **(ANSWER QUESTION 16)**

2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 17 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**

DK. Don't Know **(SKIP TO QUESTION 17 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**

16. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits are available to temporary full-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution? If available, indicate whether each benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER A BENEFIT IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK")*

		(16A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes ——→ 2. No DK	1	2	3

17. What percentage of undergraduate instruction, as measured by total student credit hours taught, is carried by all full-time permanent and temporary instructional faculty/staff? Student credit hours are defined as the number of course credits or contact hours multiplied by the number of students enrolled. *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. NONE
2. Less than 10%
3. 10-24%
4. 25-49%
5. 50-74%
6. 75-99%
7. 100%

18. Are any of the following used in assessing the teaching performance of full-time (permanent or temporary) instructional faculty/staff at this institution? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR "DK" ON EACH LINE)*

Yes	No	Don't Know		
1	2	DK	a.	Student evaluations
1	2	DK	b.	Student test scores
1	2	DK	c.	Student career placement
1	2	DK	d.	Other measures of student performance
1	2	DK	e.	Department/division chair evaluations
1	2	DK	f.	Dean evaluations
1	2	DK	g.	Peer evaluations
1	2	DK	h.	Self-evaluations
1	2	DK	i.	Other *(DESCRIBE)* ______________________________

19. Are any of your full-time instructional faculty/staff legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining with this institution? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ——▸ (A.) ____% (approximate) percent represented *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE)*
2. No

SECTION II: FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

IF YOU INDICATED YOUR INSTITUTION HAD NO FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (AT QUESTION 1c), PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION III, PAGE 15. OTHERWISE, CONTINUE WITH SECTION II.

QUESTIONS 20-30 APPLY TO PERMANENT FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY (REFER TO THE GLOSSARY ON PAGE 1). PLEASE WRITE IN BELOW EXAMPLES OF SOME OF THE TITLES OR POSITIONS HELD BY NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AT YOUR INSTITUTION (e.g., RESEARCH SCIENTIST, COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR, VICE-PRESIDENT, ETC.).

____

____

____

QUESTIONS 31-33 APPLY TO TEMPORARY FULL-TIME NON-INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY.

20. **Please provide the following information about changes in the number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty between the 1991 and 1992 Fall Terms.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0." IF YOU DON'T KNOW, WRITE IN "DK")*

_____ a. Total permanent full-time non-instructional faculty during 1992 Fall Term

_____ b. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty at the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term who were hired since the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term

_____ c. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who retired between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ d. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who left because of downsizing between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ e. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who left for other reasons between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term

_____ f. Total permanent full-time non-instructional faculty during 1991 Fall Term

21. **Does your institution have a tenure system for full-time non-instructional faculty?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 27 ON PAGE 12)**

22. **During the 1992 and 1991 Fall Terms, how many tenured and tenure-track full-time non-instructional faculty did your institution have?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Tenured, 1992 Fall Term

_____ b. Tenure-track, 1992 Fall Term

_____ c. Tenured, 1991 Fall Term

_____ d. Tenure-track, 1991 Fall Term

23. **Of those tenured non-instructional faculty who left your institution between the beginning of the 1991 Fall Term and the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term, how many left for each of the following reasons?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Retirement
_____ b. Downsizing
_____ c. For other reasons

24. **During the 1992-93 academic year (i.e., Fall 1992 through Spring 1993), how many full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution were considered for tenure, and how many were granted tenure?** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ a. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty considered for tenure
_____ b. Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty granted tenure

25. **Fill in the following information about the maximum number of years full-time non-instructional faculty can be on a tenure track.** *(WRITE IN A NUMBER ON EACH LINE)*

_____ Yrs a. Maximum number of years full-time non-instructional faculty staff can be on a tenure track and not receive tenure *(IF NO MAXIMUM, WRITE IN "0")*
_____ Yrs b. If maximum number of years has changed during past 5 years, write in previous maximum *(IF NO CHANGE, WRITE IN "0")*

26. **During the past five years, has your institution done any of the following?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ACTION)*

Yes	No		
1	2	a.	Replaced some tenured or tenure-track full-time non-instructional faculty positions with faculty on fixed-term contracts
1	2	b.	Made the standards more stringent for granting tenure to full-time non-instructional faculty
1	2	c.	Taken any other actions designed to lower the percent of tenured full-time non-instructional faculty *(DESCRIBE ANY ACTIONS TAKEN)*

____

____

27. **During the past five years, has your institution offered early or phased retirement to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ——▸ (A.) ____ Number of permanent full-time non-instructional faculty who took advantage of this offer during the past five years *(WRITE IN A NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

2. No

28. **Indicate if each of the retirement plans listed below is available to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution. If available, please indicate whether the plan is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

		(28A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. TIAA/CREF plan	1. Yes ———▸ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Other 403B plan	1. Yes ———▸ 2. No	1	2	3
c. State plan	1. Yes ———▸ 2. No	1	2	3
d. 401K or 401B plan	1. Yes ———▸ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Other retirement plan	1. Yes ———▸ 2. No	1	2	3

29. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits is available at your institution to any permanent full-time non-instructional faculty. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.**

			(29A)	
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No	1	2	3

30. **What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to the total benefits package for permanent full-time non-instructional faculty?** *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

_____ %

31. **Are any of the employee benefits described at Question 29 available to temporary full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR DK)*

1. Yes **(ANSWER QUESTION 32)**
2. No **(SKIP TO SECTION III ON PAGE 15)**

DK. Don't Know **(SKIP TO SECTION III ON PAGE 15)**

32. **Indicate which of these employee benefits is available to temporary full-time non-instructional faculty at your institution. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** (IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A BENEFIT IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK") **(32A)**

		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes → 2. No DK	1	2	3

33. **Are any of your full-time non-instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining with this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes → (A.) _____ (approximate) percent represented *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE)*
2. No

SECTION III: PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF

IF YOU INDICATED THAT YOUR INSTITUTION HAD NO PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY/STAFF (AT QUESTION 1b), PLEASE SKIP TO PAGE 20. OTHERWISE, CONTINUE WITH SECTION III.

34. **Are any retirement plans available to any part-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 36)**

35. **Indicate which of the retirement plans listed below is available to any part-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution. If available, please indicate whether the plan is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A PLAN IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK")*

(35A)

		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. TIAA/CREF plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No DK	1	2	3
b. Other 403B plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No DK	1	2	3
c. State plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No DK	1	2	3
d. 401K or 401B plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No DK	1	2	3
e. Other retirement plan	1. Yes ——▸ 2. No DK	1	2	3

36. **Are any employee benefits available to any part-time instructional faculty/staff at your institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes **(CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 37 ON THE NEXT PAGE)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 41 ON PAGE 17)**

37. **Indicate which of the following employee benefits is available at your institution to** any **part-time instructional faculty/staff. If available, indicate whether the benefit is subsidized or not subsidized by your institution.** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A BENEFIT IS AVAILABLE, CIRCLE "DK")*

		(37A)		
		Fully Subsidized	**Partially Subsidized**	**Not Subsidized**
a. Wellness program or health promotion	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
b. Medical insurance or medical care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
c. Dental insurance or dental care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
d. Disability insurance program	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
e. Life insurance	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
f. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for spouse	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
g. Tuition remission/grants at this or other institutions for children	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
h. Child care	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
i. Housing/mortgage	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
j. Meals	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
k. Transportation/parking	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
l. Maternity leave	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
m. Paternity leave	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
n. Medical insurance for retirees	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
o. "Cafeteria-style" benefits plan (plan under which staff can trade off some benefits for others, following guidelines established by the institution)	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3
p. Other	1. Yes ⟶ 2. No DK	1	2	3

38. **What is the average percentage of salary that is contributed by your institution to the total benefits package for part-time instructional faculty/staff?** *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

____ %

39. **Does your institution have any criteria that must be met in order for part-time instructional faculty/staff to be eligible for any benefits?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes　　　2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 41)**

40. **Indicate which requirements must be met at your institution by part-time instructional faculty/staff to be eligible for any benefits?** *(IF YOU DON'T KNOW IF A REQUIREMENT APPLIES, CIRCLE "DK")*

		(40A)	(40B)
		Description of Requirement	**Percent of Part-time Instructional faculty/staff That Meet This Requirement**
a. Minimum number of hours employed per week at institution	1. Yes → 2. No DK	_____ number of hours required per week	____%
b. Minimum length of time employed at institution	1. Yes → 2. No DK	*(CIRCLE ONE)* 1. Less than one academic year 2. One academic year 3. More than one academic year	____%
c. Other requirement	1. Yes → 2. No DK	*(DESCRIBE)* __________ __________________ __________________	____%

41. **What percentage of undergraduate instruction, as measured by total student credit hours taught, is carried by part-time instructional faculty/staff? Student credit hours are defined as the number of course credits or contact hours multiplied by the number of students enrolled.** *(NOTE: THE PERCENTAGES YOU INDICATE HERE PLUS ANY PERCENTAGES YOU INDICATED AT QUESTION 17 ON PAGE 9 SHOULD NOT EXCEED 100%)*

1. NONE
2. Less than 10%
3. 10-24%
4. 25-49%
5. 50-74
6. 75-99%
7. 100%

42. Are any of the following used in assessing the teaching performance of part-time instructional faculty/staff at this institution? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER OR "DK" ON EACH LINE)*

Yes	No	Don't Know		
1	2	DK	a.	Student evaluations
1	2	DK	b.	Student test scores
1	2	DK	c.	Student career placement
1	2	DK	d.	Other measures of student performance
1	2	DK	e.	Department/division chair evaluations
1	2	DK	f.	Dean evaluations
1	2	DK	g.	Peer evaluations
1	2	DK	h.	Self-evaluations
1	2	DK	i.	Other *(DESCRIBE)* ____________________________

43. Are any of your part-time instructional faculty legally represented by a union (or other association) for purposes of collective bargaining with this institution? *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes ——▸ (A.) ____% (approximate) percent represented *(WRITE IN PERCENTAGE)*
2. No

Please fill in your name and your title at this institution, as well as the names and titles of any other individuals who have answered one or more questions in this questionnaire, and the question numbers each individual worked on. Include telephone numbers in case we have any questions about any entries.

Your responses to these items, as with all other items in this questionnaire, are voluntary and strictly confidential. The information provided in this questionnaire will be used only in statistical summaries. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals, including names and telephone numbers, will be removed from survey files.

YOUR NAME: ____________________ TITLE: ____________________
PHONE #: ____________________ QUESTIONS #s: ____________________

OTHER NAME: ____________________ TITLE: ____________________
PHONE #: ____________________ QUESTIONS #s: ____________________

OTHER NAME: ____________________ TITLE: ____________________
PHONE #: ____________________ QUESTIONS #s: ____________________

OTHER NAME: ____________________ TITLE: ____________________
PHONE #: ____________________ QUESTIONS #s: ____________________

OTHER NAME: ____________________ TITLE: ____________________
PHONE #: ____________________ QUESTIONS #s: ____________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED PREPAID ENVELOPE TO:

National Opinion Research Center (4552)
University of Chicago
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

RESPONDENT LABEL

Appendix H

1993 NSOPF Abbreviated Faculty Questionnaire

OMB No. 1850-0608
Expiration Date: 12/93

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
National Center for Education Statistics

1993 NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

P. 4552 - NSOPF
October 29, 1993

REFUSAL CONVERSION - Date: ____________________

R Name: ____________________

CASE ID: ____________________

Institution: ____________________

Phone: ( ) ____________________

IWER: ____________________

Have you updated call notes in TNMS – "COMPLETE ABBREVIATED QUEX" ?

YES NO

++

QUEUE STATUS ____________________

DATE MOVED: ____________________

All information on this form will be kept confidential and will not be disclosed or released to your institution or any other group or individual.

Co-sponsored by: National Science Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities

Contractor: National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
Mailing Address:
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615
Toll-Free Number: 1-800-733-NORC

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY

Instructions for Completing Faculty Questionnaire

Many of our questions ask about your activities during the 1992 Fall Term. By this, we mean whatever academic term was in progress on October 15, 1992.

All questions that ask about your position at "this institution" refer to your position during the 1992 Fall Term ***at the institution listed on the label on the back cover of the questionnaire.***

This questionnaire was designed to be completed by both full-time and part-time instructional faculty and staff, and non-instructional faculty, in 2- and 4-year (and above) higher education institutions of all types and sizes. Please read each question carefully and follow all instructions. Some of the questions may not appear to fit your situation precisely; if you have a response other than those listed for a particular question, write in that response.

Most questions ask you to circle a number to indicate your response. Circle the number in front of your response and not the response itself. Other questions ask you to fill in information; write in the information in the space provided.

Mailing instructions for returning the completed questionnaire are on page 26.

If you have any questions on how to proceed, please call NORC toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC.

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY:
Faculty Questionnaire

EXACT TIME NOW: ____________

1. **During the 1992 Fall Term, did you have any instructional duties at this institution (e.g., teaching one or more courses, or advising or supervising students' academic activities)?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes **(ANSWER 1A)** 2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 2)**

1A. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were . . .** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. *all* of your instructional duties related to credit courses.
2. some of your instructional duties related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit, or
3. *all* of your instructional duties related to *non*credit courses or advising or supervising *noncredit* academic activities?

2. **What was your principal activity at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term? If you have equal responsibilities, please select one.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)
4. Clinical service
5. Community/public service
6. Administration
   (WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ____________________
7. On sabbatical from this institution
8. Other (subsidized performer, artist-in-residence, etc.)

3. **During the 1992 Fall Term, did you have faculty status at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No, I did not have faculty status
3. No, no one has faculty status at this institution

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION A. NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT

4. **During the 1992 Fall Term, did this institution consider you to be employed part-time or full-time?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Part-time 2. Full-time

7. **What was your tenure status at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Tenured → **7A. In what year did you achieve tenure at this institution?** 19 ☐☐
2. On tenure track but not tenured **(SKIP TO QUESTION 9)**
3. Not on tenure track
4. No tenure system for my faculty status
5. No tenure system at this institution

9. **Which of the following best describes your academic rank, title, or position at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER, OR "NA")*

NA. Not applicable: no ranks designated at this institution **(SKIP TO QUESTION 11)**

1. Professor
2. Associate Professor
3. Assistant Professor
4. Instructor
5. Lecturer
6. Other *(WRITE IN)* ________________________________

11. **During the 1992 Fall Term, which of the following kinds of appointments did you hold at this institution?** *(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)*

1. Acting
2. Affiliate or adjunct
3. Visiting
4. Assigned by religious order
5. Clinical
(WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ________________________________
6. Research
(WRITE IN TITLE OR POSITION) ________________________________
7. None of the above

12. **What is your principal field or discipline of teaching?** *(REFER TO THE LIST OF MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY ON PAGES 5 AND 6 AND ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE NUMBER AND NAME BELOW. IF YOU HAVE NO FIELD OF TEACHING, CIRCLE "NA")*

NA. Not Applicable

CODE FOR FIELD
OR DISCIPLINE: __________ __________________________
NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE

13. **What is your principal area of research? If equal areas, select one.** *(IF YOU HAVE NO RESEARCH AREA, CIRCLE "NA")*

NA. Not Applicable

CODE FOR FIELD
OR DISCIPLINE: __________ __________________________
NAME OF PRINCIPAL FIELD/DISCIPLINE

CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

AGRICULTURE

101	Agribusiness & Agricultural Production
102	Agricultural, Animal, Food, & Plant Sciences
103	Renewable Natural Resources, including Conservation, Fishing, & Forestry
110	Other Agriculture

ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

121	Architecture & Environmental Design
122	City, Community, & Regional Planning
123	Interior Design
124	Land Use Management & Reclamation
130	Other Arch. & Environmental Design

ART

141	Art History & Appreciation
142	Crafts
143	Dance
144	Design (other than Arch. or Interior)
145	Dramatic Arts
146	Film Arts
147	Fine Arts
148	Music
149	Music History & Appreciation
150	Other Visual & Performing Arts

BUSINESS

161	Accounting
162	Banking & Finance
163	Business Administration & Management
164	Business Administrative Support (e.g., Bookkeeping, Office Management, Secretarial)
165	Human Resources Development
166	Organizational Behavior
167	Marketing & Distribution
170	Other Business

COMMUNICATIONS

181	Advertising
182	Broadcasting & Journalism
183	Communications Research
184	Communication Technologies
190	Other Communications

COMPUTER SCIENCE

201	Computer & Information Sciences
202	Computer Programming
203	Data Processing
204	Systems Analysis
210	Other Computer Science

EDUCATION

221	Education, General
222	Basic Skills
223	Bilingual/Cross-cultural Education
224	Curriculum & Instruction
225	Education Administration
226	Education Evaluation & Research
227	Educational Psychology
228	Special Education
229	Student Counseling & Personnel Svcs.
230	Other Education

TEACHER EDUCATION

241	Pre-Elementary
242	Elementary
243	Secondary
244	Adult & Continuing
245	Other General Teacher Ed. Programs
250	Teacher Education in Specific Subjects

ENGINEERING

261	Engineering, General
262	Civil Engineering
263	Electrical, Electronics, & Communication Engineering
264	Mechanical Engineering
265	Chemical Engineering
270	Other Engineering
280	Engineering-Related Technologies

ENGLISH AND LITERATURE

291	English, General
292	Composition & Creative Writing
293	American Literature
294	English Literature
295	Linguistics
296	Speech, Debate, & Forensics
297	English as a Second Language
300	English, Other

	FOREIGN LANGUAGES
311	Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, or Other Chinese)
312	French
313	German
314	Italian
315	Latin
316	Japanese
317	Other Asian
318	Russian or Other Slavic
319	Spanish
320	Other Foreign Languages
	HEALTH SCIENCES
331	Allied Health Technologies & Services
332	Dentistry
333	Health Services Administration
334	Medicine, including Psychiatry
335	Nursing
336	Pharmacy
337	Public Health
338	Veterinary Medicine
340	Other Health Sciences
350	HOME ECONOMICS
360	INDUSTRIAL ARTS
370	LAW
380	LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCIENCES
	NATURAL SCIENCES: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
391	Biochemistry
392	Biology
393	Botany
394	Genetics
395	Immunology
396	Microbiology
397	Physiology
398	Zoology
400	Biological Sciences, Other
	NATURAL SCIENCES: PHYSICAL SCIENCES
411	Astronomy
412	Chemistry
413	Physics
414	Earth, Atmosphere, and Oceanographic (Geological Sciences)
420	Physical Sciences, Other
430	MATHEMATICS
440	STATISTICS
450	MILITARY STUDIES
460	MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
470	PARKS & RECREATION
480	PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION
490	THEOLOGY
500	PROTECTIVE SERVICES (e.g., Criminal Justice, Fire Protection)
510	PSYCHOLOGY
520	PUBLIC AFFAIRS (e.g., Community Services, Public Administration, Public Works, Social Work)
530	SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES
	SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY
541	Social Sciences, General
542	Anthropology
543	Archeology
544	Area & Ethnic Studies
545	Demography
546	Economics
547	Geography
548	History
549	International Relations
550	Political Science & Government
551	Sociology
560	Other Social Sciences
	VOCATIONAL TRAINING
	CONSTRUCTION TRADES
601	Carpentry
602	Electrician
603	Plumbing
610	Other Construction Trades
	CONSUMER, PERSONAL, & MISC. SERVICES
621	Personal Services (e.g., Barbering, Cosmetology)
630	Other Consumer Services
	MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS
641	Electrical & Electronics Equipment Repair
642	Heating, Air Conditioning, & Refrigeration Mechanics & Repairers
643	Vehicle & Mobile Equipment Mechanics & Repairers
644	Other Mechanics & Repairers
	PRECISION PRODUCTION
661	Drafting
662	Graphic & Print Communications
663	Leatherworking & Upholstering
664	Precision Metal Work
665	Woodworking
670	Other Precision Production Work
	TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIAL MOVING
681	Air Transportation (e.g., Piloting, Traffic Control, Flight Attendance, Aviation Management)
682	Land Vehicle & Equipment Operation
683	Water Transportation (e.g., Boat & Fishing Operations, Deep Water Diving, Marina Operations, Sailors & Deckhands)
690	Other Transportation & Material Moving
900	OTHER *(IF YOU USE THIS CODE, BE SURE TO WRITE IN A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION AT QUESTIONS 12-13, AND 16)*

SECTION B. ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

16. Please indicate the highest degree or other formal award that you hold, the year you received it, (the field code from pages 5-6 that applies), name of the field, and the name and location of the institution from which you received that degree or award. Do not list honorary degrees. *(COMPLETE ALL COLUMNS)*

CODES FOR TYPE OF DEGREE

1 Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., LL.B., etc.)
2 Doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)
3 Master's degree or equivalent
4 Bachelor's degree or equivalent
5 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of more than 2 years but less than 4 years in length
6 Associate's degree or equivalent
7 Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of at least 1 year but less than 2 years in length

	A. Degree Code (see above)	B. Year Received	C. Field Code (from pp. 5-6)	D. Name of Field (from pp. 5-6)	E. Name of Institution (a) and City and State/Country of Institution (b)
(1) Highest	_____	19_____	_______	____________________	a. ____________________
				____________________	____________________
					b. ____________________
					____________________

17. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you employed only at this institution, or did you also have other employment including any outside consulting or other self-owned business, or private practice?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Employed only at this institution **(SKIP TO QUESTION 19)**
2. Had other employment, consulting, self-owned business, or private practice

17A. **How many different jobs, other than your employment at this institution, did you have during the 1992 Fall Term? Include all outside consulting, self-owned business, and private practice.** *(WRITE IN NUMBER)*

__________ Number of Jobs

18. **Not counting any employment at this institution, what was the employment sector of the main other job you held during Fall 1992?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. 4-year college or university, graduate or professional school
2. 2-year or other postsecondary institution
3. Elementary or secondary school
4. Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice
5. Hospital or other health care or clinical setting
6. Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization
7. For-profit business or industry in the private sector
8. Federal government, including military, or state or local government
9. Other *(WRITE IN)* ______________________________

18A. **What year did you begin that job?** *(WRITE IN YEAR)*

19 ☐☐

18B. **What was your primary responsibility in that job?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Teaching
2. Research
3. Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)
4. Clinical service
5. Community/public service
6. Administration
7. Other

18C. **Was that job full-time or part-time?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Full-time
2. Part-time

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

19. The next questions ask about your most recent (last) job that ended before the beginning of the 1992 Fall Term. For the (last) most recent and significant main job that you held during the past 15 years, indicate the year you began and the year you left, the employment sector, your primary responsibility, and whether you were employed full-time or part-time.

- Do not list promotions in rank at one place of employment as different jobs.
- Do not include temporary positions (i.e., summer positions) or work as a graduate student.
- List each job (other than promotion in rank) separately.

If not applicable, circle "NA" ⟶	NA
(1) YEARS JOB HELD	A. MOST RECENT MAIN JOB (PRIOR TO FALL 1992)
FROM:	19_____
TO:	19_____
(2) EMPLOYMENT SECTOR	(CIRCLE ONE)
4-year college or university, graduate or professional school	1
2-year or other postsecondary institution	2
Elementary or secondary school	3
Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice	4
Hospital or other health care or clinical setting	5
Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization	6
For-profit business or industry in the private sector	7
Federal government, including military, or state or local government	8
Other	9
(3) PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY	(CIRCLE ONE)
Teaching	1
Research	2
Technical activities (e.g., programmer, technician, chemist, engineer, etc.)	3
Clinical service	4
Community/public service	5
Administration	6
Other	7
(4) FULL-TIME/PART-TIME	(CIRCLE ONE)
Full-time	1
Part-time	2

SECTION C. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORKLOAD

22. **During the 1992 Fall Term, what was the total number of classes or sections you taught at this institution? Do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual performance classes. Count multiple sections of the same course as a separate class, but not the lab section of a course.**
(WRITE IN A NUMBER, OR CIRCLE "0")

0. No classes taught **(SKIP TO QUESTION 25)** 28

_____ Number of classes/sections **(ANSWER 22A)**

22A. **How many of those classes were classes for credit?**

0. No classes for credit **(SKIP TO QUESTION 28)**

_____ Number of classes/sections for credit **(ANSWER QUESTION 23)**

23. **For each class or section that you taught for credit at this institution during the 1992 Fall Term, please answer the following items. Do not include individualized instruction, such as independent study or individual one-on-one performance classes.**

If you taught multiple sections of the same course, count them as separate classes, but do not include the lab section of the course as a separate class. For each class, enter the code for the academic discipline of the class. (Refer to pages 5-6 for the codes. Please enter the code rather than the course name.)

	A.	B.
	FIRST FOR-CREDIT CLASS	SECOND FOR-CREDIT CLASS
(1) CODE FOR ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF CLASS (from pp. 5-6)	☐	☐
(2) DURING 1992 FALL TERM		
Number of weeks the class met?	a. _____	a. _____
Number of credit hours?	b. _____	b. _____
Number of hours the class met per week?	c. _____	c. _____
Number of teaching assistants, readers?	d. _____	d. _____
Number of students enrolled?	e. _____	e. _____
Was this class team taught?	f. 1. Yes 2. No	f. 1. Yes 2. No
Average # hours per week *you* taught the class?	g. _____	g. _____
(3) PRIMARY LEVEL OF STUDENTS	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*
Lower division students (first or second year postsecondary) or	1	1
Upper division students (third or fourth year postsecondary) or	2	2
Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students, or	3	3
All other students?	4	4

C.	D.	E.	
THIRD FOR-CREDIT CLASS	FOURTH FOR-CREDIT CLASS	FIFTH FOR-CREDIT CLASS	
☐	☐	☐	
a. ________	a. ________	a. ________	a. Number of weeks the class
b. ________	b. ________	b. ________	b. Number of credit hours
c. ________	c. ________	c. ________	c. Number of hours the class
d. ________	d. ________	d. ________	d. Number of teaching
e. ________	e. ________	e. ________	e. Number of students
f. 1. Yes 2. No	f. 1. Yes 2. No	f. 1. Yes 2. No	f. Was this class team taught
g. ________	g. ________	g. ________	g. Average # hours per week
(CIRCLE ONE)	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	*(CIRCLE ONE)*	
1	1	1	Lower division students
2	2	2	Upper division students
3	3	3	Graduate, post-baccalaureate students
4	4	4	All other students

28. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you engaged in any professional research, writing, or creative works?**

1. Yes **(ANSWER QUESTION 29)**
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 36)**

29. **How would you describe your primary professional research, writing, or creative work during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Pure or basic research
2. Applied research
3. Policy-oriented research or analysis
4. Literary or expressive
5. Program/Curriculum design and development
6. Other

30. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you engaged in any funded research or funded creative endeavors? Includ any grants, contracts, or institutional awards. Do not include consulting services.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 36)**

31. **During the 1992 Fall Term, were you a principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (Co-PI) for an grants or contracts?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Yes
2. No **(SKIP TO QUESTION 36)**

32. **During the 1992 Fall Term, how many individuals other than yourself were supported by all the grants and contracts for which you were PI or Co-PI?** *(WRITE IN NUMBER; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*

______ Number of individuals

36. **On the average, how many hours per week did you spend at each of the following kinds of activities during the 1992 Fall Term?** *(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES)*

Average number hours per week
during the 1992 Fall Term

________________ a. All paid activities at this institution (teaching, research, administration, etc.)

________________ b. All unpaid activities at this institution

________________ c. Any other paid activities outside this institution (e.g., consulting, working on other jobs)

________________ d. Unpaid (pro bono) professional service activities outside this institution

37. **In column A, we ask you to allocate your total work time in the Fall of 1992 (as reported in Question 36) into several categories. We realize that they are not mutually exclusive categories (e.g., research may include teaching; preparing a course may be part of professional growth). We ask, however, that you allocate as best you can the proportion of your time spent in activities whose primary focus falls within the indicated categories. In column B, indicate what percentage of your time you would prefer to spend in each of the listed categories.**

A. **% of Work Time Spent**	*(WRITE IN A PERCENTAGE ON EACH LINE. IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE; IF NONE, WRITE IN "0")*	**B.** **% of Work Time Preferred**
_____%	a. **Teaching** (including teaching, grading papers, preparing courses; developing new curricula; advising or supervising students; working with student organizations or intramural athletics)	_____%
_____%	b. **Research/Scholarship** (including research; reviewing or preparing articles or books; attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences; reviewing proposals; seeking outside funding; giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts, or giving speeches)	_____%
_____%	c. **Professional Growth** (including taking courses, pursuing an advanced degree; other professional development activities, such as practice or activities to remain current in your field)	_____%
_____%	d. **Administration**	_____%
_____%	e. **Outside Consulting or Freelance Work**	_____%
_____%	f. **Service/Other Non-Teaching Activities** (including providing legal or medical services or psychological counseling to clients or patients; paid or unpaid community or public service, service to professional societies/associations; other activities or work not listed in a-e)	_____%
100%	PLEASE BE SURE THAT THE PERCENTAGES YOU PROVIDE ADD UP TO 100% OF THE TOTAL TIME.	100%

SECTION D. JOB SATISFACTION ISSUES

40. **How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with . . .**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	i. your job here, overall

41. **During the next three years, how likely is it that you will leave this job to . . .** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITEM)*

Not At All Likely	Somewhat Likely	Very Likely	
1	2	3	a. accept a part-time job at a different postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	b. accept a full-time job at a different postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	c. accept a part-time job not at a postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	d. accept a full-time job not at a postsecondary institution?
1	2	3	e. retire from the labor force?

42. **At what age do you think you are most likely to stop working at a postsecondary institution?** *(WRITE IN AGE, OR CIRCLE "DK")*

_________ Years of age

DK. Don't know

43. **If you were to leave your current position in academia to accept another position inside or outside of acad how important would each of the following be in your decision?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ITE*

Not Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	
1	2	3	a. Salary level
1	2	3	b. Tenure-track/tenured position
1	2	3	c. Job security
1	2	3	d. Opportunities for advancement
1	2	3	e. Benefits
1	2	3	f. No pressure to publish
1	2	3	g. Good research facilities and equipment
1	2	3	h. Good instructional facilities and equipment
1	2	3	i. Good job or job opportunities for my spouse or partner
1	2	3	j. Good geographic location
1	2	3	k. Good environment/schools for my children
1	2	3	l. Greater opportunity to teach
1	2	3	m. Greater opportunity to do research
1	2	3	n. Greater opportunity for administrative responsibilities

44. If you could elect to draw on your retirement and still continue working at your institution on a part-time basis, would you do so? *(CIRCLE ONE)*

1. Yes

2. No

DK. Don't know

45. If an early retirement option were offered to you at your institution, would you take it? *(CIRCLE ONE)*

1. Yes

2. No

DK. Don't know

46. At which age do you think you are most likely to retire from all paid employment? *(WRITE IN AGE, OR CIRCLE "DK")*

__________ Years of age

DK. Don't know

SECTION E. COMPENSATION

Note: Your responses to these items as with all other items in this questionnaire are voluntary and strictly confidential. They will be used only in statistical summaries, and will not be disclosed to your institution or to any individual or group. Furthermore, all information that would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be removed from the survey files.

47. For the calendar year 1992, estimate your gross compensation before taxes from each of the sources listed below.

(IF NOT SURE, GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATES; IF NO COMPENSATION FROM A SOURCE, WRITE IN "0")

Compensation from this institution:

$ ____________ a. Basic salary → b. **Type of appointment (e.g., 9 months)** ☐ **# of months**

$ ____________ c. Other teaching at this institution not included in basic salary (e.g., for summer session)

$ ____________ d. Supplements not included in basic salary (for administration, research, coaching sports, etc.)

$ ____________ e. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)

$ ____________ f. Any other income from this institution

Compensation from other sources:

$ ____________ g. Employment at another academic institution

$ ____________ h. Legal or medical services or psychological counseling

$ ____________ i. Outside consulting, consulting business or freelance work

$ ____________ j. Self-owned business (other than consulting)

$ ____________ k. Professional performances or exhibitions

$ ____________ l. Speaking fees, honoraria

$ ____________ m. Royalties or commissions

$ ____________ n. Any other employment

$ ____________ o. Non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car (Do not include employee benefits such as medical, dental, or life insurance)

Other sources of earned income *(WRITE IN BELOW)*:

$ ____________ p. ____

$ ____________ q. ____

48. For the calendar year 1992, how many persons were in your household including yourself?

________ Total number in household

49. For the calendar year 1992, what was your total household income?

$ ____________ Total household income

50. For the calendar year 1992, how many dependents did you have? Do not include yourself. (A dependent is someone receiving at least half of his or her support from you.)

________ Number of dependents

SECTION F. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

51. **Are you . . .**

1. male, or
2. female?

52. **In what month and year were you born?**
(WRITE IN MONTH AND YEAR)

☐☐ 19 ☐☐
MONTH YEAR

53. **What is your race?** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
2. Asian or Pacific Islander (ANSWER 53A) ⟶
3. African American/Black
4. White
5. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

53A. **What is your Asian or Pacific Islander origin? If more than one, circle the one you consider the most important part of your background.** *(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)*

1. Chinese
2. Filipino
3. Japanese
4. Korean
5. Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian/Kampuchean, etc.)
6. Pacific Islander
7. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

(SKIP TO QUESTION 55)

54. **Are you of Hispanic descent?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Yes (ANSWER 54A)
2. No (SKIP TO QUESTION 55)

54A. **What is your Spanish/Hispanic origin? If more than one, circle the one you consider the most important part of your background.**

1. Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano
2. Cuban, Cubano
3. Puerto Rican, Puertorriqueno, or Bouricuan
4. Other *(WRITE IN BELOW)*

____

55. **What is your current marital status?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Living with someone in a marriage-like relationship
4. Separated
5. Divorced
6. Widowed

56. **In what country were you born?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. USA
2. Other *(WRITE IN)*____

57. **What is your citizenship status?**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. United States citizen, native
2. United States citizen, naturalized
3. Permanent resident of the United States (immigrant visa)

____
COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP

4. Temporary resident of United States (non-immigrant visa)

____
COUNTRY OF PRESENT CITIZENSHIP

59. **Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statement.**
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly	
1	2	3	4	g. If I had it to do over again, I would still choose an academic career.

60. **Please indicate your opinion regarding whether each of the following has worsened, stayed the same, or improved in recent years at this institution.** *(CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH ITEM)*

Worsened	Stayed the Same	Improved	Don't Know	
1	2	3	DK	g. The quality of undergraduate education at this institution
1	2	3	DK	i. The quality of research at this institution

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

EXACT TIME NOW: ______________

Appendix I

Critical Items and Nonresponse:
1993 NSOPF Faculty Questionnaire

Item Nonresponse Rates: Critical Items

Item Nonresponse Rates: Total Respondents
Item Nonresponse Rates Greater Than 10 Percent
Item Nonresponse Rates for Total Respondents, Sorted by Rate

Item Nonresponse Rates: SAQ Respondents
Item Nonresponse Rates Greater Than 10 Percent (SAQ)
Item Nonresponse Rates for SAQ Respondents, Sorted by Rate

Item Nonresponse Rates: CATI Respondents
Item Nonresponse Rates Greater Than 10 Percent (CATI)
Item Nonresponse Rates for CATI Respondents, Sorted by Rate

Item Nonresponse Rates: Critical Items

NSOPF-93 Critical Items

Faculty Questionnaire

_1	Had any instructional duties during in Fall 1992 term
_1A	Did instructional duties relate to for-credit courses?
A4	Employed full- or part-time
A7	Tenure status at institution
A9	Academic rank, title or position
A12A	Principal field or discipline of teaching
A13A	Principal field or discipline of research
B16A1	Highest degree held
B16C1	Field code of highest degree
C22A	Number of for-credit classes taught in Fall 1992
C23A1B	Discipline of first for-credit class taught
C23B1B	Discipline of second for-credit class taught
C23C1B	Discipline of third for-credit class taught
C23D1B	Discipline of fourth for-credit class taught
C23E1B	Discipline of fifth for-credit class taught
C23A2B	Credit hours of first for-credit class taught
C23B2B	Credit hours of second for-credit class taught
C23C2B	Credit hours of third for-credit class taught
C23D2B	Credit hours of fourth for-credit class taught
C23E2B	Credit hours of fifth for-credit class taught
C23A2E	Number of students enrolled in first for-credit class taught
C23B2E	Number of students enrolled in second for-credit class taught
C23C2E	Number of students enrolled in third for-credit class taught
C23D2E	Number of students enrolled in fourth for-credit class taught
C23E2E	Number of students enrolled in fifth for-credit class taught
C23A3	Primary level of students in first for-credit class taught
C23B3	Primary level of students in second for-credit class taught
C23C3	Primary level of students in third for-credit class taught
C23D3	Primary level of students in fourth for-credit class taught
C23E3	Primary level of students in fifth for-credit class taught
C28	Current professional research, writing or creative works
F51	Respondent's gender
F52A	Month of respondent's birth
F52B	Year of respondents's birth
F53A	Respondent's race
F53AA	Is respondent Asian-Pacific Islander?
F54	Is respondent Hispanic?
F54AA	Background of Hispanic origin
F57A	Respondent's citizenship status
F57C	Country of present citizenship if resident immigrant

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CRITICAL ITEMS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
_1	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	7	0.000272	0.000103
_1A	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	24331	797	0.032757	0.001141
A4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	19	0.000737	0.000169
A7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	213	0.008262	0.000564
A9	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	143	0.005547	0.000463
A12A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	162	0.006284	0.000492
A13A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	224	0.008689	0.000578
B16A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	28	0.001100	0.000208
B16C1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	42	0.001650	0.000254
C22A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	22823	31	0.001358	0.000244
C23A1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	547	0.025110	0.001060
C23A2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	776	0.035622	0.001256
C23A2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	141	0.006473	0.000543
C23A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	368	0.016893	0.000873
C23B1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	370	0.022947	0.001179
C23B2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	449	0.027847	0.001296
C23B2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	103	0.006388	0.000627
C23B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	262	0.016249	0.000996
C23C1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	237	0.022529	0.001447
C23C2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	261	0.024810	0.001517
C23C2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	102	0.009696	0.000955
C23C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	212	0.020152	0.001370
C23D1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	156	0.025944	0.002050
C23D2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	176	0.029270	0.002174
C23D2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	89	0.014801	0.001557
C23D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	158	0.026276	0.002063
C23E1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	112	0.041161	0.003808
C23E2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	130	0.047777	0.004089
C23E2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	88	0.032341	0.003391
C23E3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	107	0.039324	0.003726
C28	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	57	0.002211	0.000293
F51	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	10	0.000388	0.000123
F52A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	258	0.010008	0.000620
F52B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	277	0.010745	0.000642
F53A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	88	0.003413	0.000363
F53AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1224	63	0.051471	0.006316
F54	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	24558	63	0.002565	0.000323
F54AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1226	22	0.017945	0.003791
F57A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	148	0.005741	0.000471
F57C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1460	124	0.084932	0.007296

Item Nonresponse Rates: Total Respondents
Item Nonresponse Rates Greater Than 10 Percent
Item Nonresponse Rates for Total Respondents, Sorted by Rate

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
_1	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	7	0.000272	0.000103
_1A	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	24331	797	0.032757	0.001141
_2	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	829	0.032157	0.001099
_3	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	290	0.011249	0.000657
A4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	19	0.000737	0.000169
A4AA	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	548	0.072708	0.002991
A4AB	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	540	0.071647	0.002971
A4AC	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	547	0.072575	0.002988
A4AD	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	556	0.073769	0.003011
A4AE	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	556	0.073769	0.003011
A4AF	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	554	0.073504	0.003006
A5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1412	0.054771	0.001417
A6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1526	0.059193	0.001470
A7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	213	0.008262	0.000564
A7A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	9703	512	0.052767	0.002270
A8	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	16212	989	0.061004	0.001880
A9	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	143	0.005547	0.000463
A10	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	24780	1774	0.071590	0.001638
A11_1	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_2	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_3	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A12A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	162	0.006284	0.000492
A13A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	224	0.008689	0.000578
B14_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B15_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B16A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	28	0.001100	0.000208

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B16B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	266	0.010450	0.000637
B16C1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	42	0.001650	0.000254
B16E1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	377	0.014811	0.000757
B16A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	35	0.001602	0.000271
B16B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	132	0.006041	0.000524
B16C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	83	0.003798	0.000416
B16E2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	289	0.013226	0.000773
B16A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	37	0.003069	0.000504
B16B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	79	0.006552	0.000735
B16C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	87	0.007216	0.000771
B16E3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	174	0.014431	0.001086
B16A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	27	0.011402	0.002182
B16B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	28	0.011824	0.002221
B16C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	44	0.018581	0.002775
B16E4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	74	0.031250	0.003576
B17	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	247	0.009581	0.000607
B17A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	506	0.049808	0.002158
B18	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	528	0.051974	0.002202
B18A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	379	0.037307	0.001880
B18B	B. Prof Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	470	0.046264	0.002084
B18C	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	322	0.031696	0.001738
B19A1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	193	0.010762	0.000771
B19A1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	182	0.010149	0.000748
B19A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	118	0.006580	0.000604
B19A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	451	0.025149	0.001169
B19A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	327	0.018235	0.000999
B19B1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	109	0.008961	0.000854
B19B1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	104	0.008550	0.000835
B19B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	99	0.008139	0.000815
B19B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	288	0.023676	0.001379
B19B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	285	0.023430	0.001372
B19C1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	103	0.014085	0.001378
B19C1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	92	0.012580	0.001303
B19C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	58	0.007931	0.001037
B19C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	161	0.022016	0.001716
B19C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	152	0.020785	0.001668
B20A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	657	0.025485	0.000982
B20A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	649	0.025175	0.000976
B20A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	644	0.024981	0.000972
B20A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	650	0.025213	0.000976
B20A5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	648	0.025136	0.000975
B20A6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	647	0.025097	0.000974
B20A7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	643	0.024942	0.000971
B20A8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	646	0.025058	0.000973

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B20A9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	644	0.024981	0.000972
B20A10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	652	0.025291	0.000978
B20A11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	659	0.025562	0.000983
B20A12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	649	0.025175	0.000976
B20A13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	647	0.025097	0.000974
B20A14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	645	0.025019	0.000973
B20B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	706	0.027386	0.001016
B20B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	699	0.027114	0.001012
B20B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	693	0.026881	0.001007
B20B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	696	0.026998	0.001009
B20B5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	699	0.027114	0.001012
B20B6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	699	0.027114	0.001012
B20B7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	695	0.026959	0.001009
B20B8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	698	0.027075	0.001011
B20B9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	696	0.026998	0.001009
B20B10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	702	0.027230	0.001014
B20B11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	704	0.027308	0.001015
B20B12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	697	0.027036	0.001010
B20B13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	697	0.027036	0.001010
B20B14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	696	0.026998	0.001009
C21A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	730	0.028317	0.001033
C21A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	721	0.027967	0.001027
C21A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	717	0.027812	0.001024
C21A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	721	0.027967	0.001027
C21A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	722	0.028006	0.001028
C21A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	725	0.028123	0.001030
C21B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	984	0.038169	0.001193
C21B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	965	0.037432	0.001182
C21B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	966	0.037471	0.001183
C21B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	966	0.037471	0.001183
C21B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	965	0.037432	0.001182
C21B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	965	0.037432	0.001182
C22	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	228	0.008844	0.000583
C22A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	22823	31	0.001358	0.000244
C23A1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	547	0.025110	0.001060
C23A2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	446	0.020474	0.000959
C23A2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	776	0.035622	0.001256
C23A2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	405	0.018592	0.000915
C23A2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	79	0.003627	0.000407
C23A2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	141	0.006473	0.000543
C23A2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	75	0.003443	0.000397
C23A2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	1326	0.060870	0.001620
C23A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	368	0.016893	0.000873
C23A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	2122	0.097411	0.002009

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23B1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	370	0.022947	0.001179
C23B2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	333	0.020652	0.001120
C23B2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	449	0.027847	0.001296
C23B2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	320	0.019846	0.001098
C23B2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	66	0.004093	0.000503
C23B2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	103	0.006388	0.000627
C23B2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	64	0.003969	0.000495
C23B2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	1246	0.077276	0.002103
C23B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	262	0.016249	0.000996
C23B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	1507	0.093463	0.002292
C23C1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	237	0.022529	0.001447
C23C2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	249	0.023669	0.001482
C23C2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	261	0.024810	0.001517
C23C2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	258	0.024525	0.001508
C23C2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	67	0.006369	0.000776
C23C2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	102	0.00970	0.000955
C23C2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	67	0.00637	0.000776
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	1071	0.10181	0.002948
C23C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	212	0.02015	0.001370
C23C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	1000	0.09506	0.002860
C23D1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	156	0.02594	0.002050
C23D2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	186	0.03093	0.002233
C23D2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	176	0.02927	0.002174
C23D2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	212	0.03526	0.002378
C23D2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	72	0.01197	0.001403
C23D2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	89	0.01480	0.001557
C23D2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	72	0.01197	0.001403
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	738	0.12273	0.004232
C23D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	158	0.02628	0.002063
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	603	0.10028	0.003874
C23E1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	112	0.04116	0.003808
C23E2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	136	0.04998	0.004177
C23E2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	130	0.04778	0.004089
C23E2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	139	0.05108	0.004221
C23E2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	73	0.02683	0.003098
C23E2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	88	0.03234	0.003391
C23E2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	73	0.02683	0.003098
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	389	0.14296	0.006710
C23E3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	107	0.03932	0.003726
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	313	0.11503	0.006117
C24	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21994	1247	0.05670	0.001559
C24A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	725	0.03931	0.001431
C24B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	735	0.03985	0.001440
C24C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	724	0.03925	0.001430

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C24D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	741	0.04018	0.001446
C24E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	720	0.03904	0.001426
C24F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	730	0.03958	0.001436
C24G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	730	0.03958	0.001436
C24H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	731	0.03963	0.001437
C24I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	743	0.04028	0.001448
C24J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	746	0.04045	0.001451
C24K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	738	0.04001	0.001443
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	4728	0.18340	0.002410
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5174	0.20070	0.002495
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5185	0.20112	0.002496
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5242	0.20334	0.002507
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5310	0.20597	0.002519
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5600	0.21722	0.002568
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5496	0.21319	0.002551
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5332	0.20683	0.002523
C26	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1319	0.05116	0.001372
C27	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1591	0.06171	0.001499
C28	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	57	0.00221	0.000293
C29	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	577	0.04141	0.001688
C30	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	275	0.01973	0.001178
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	9617	0.69013	0.003917
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	10569	0.75845	0.003626
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4683	581	0.12407	0.004817
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2068	574	0.27756	0.009847
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	602	0.29082	0.009982
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	561	0.32057	0.011156
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	595	0.34000	0.011324
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	530	0.44500	0.014400
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1190	560	0.47059	0.014469
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	538	0.45748	0.014527
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	541	0.46003	0.014534
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	585	0.12489	0.004830
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	596	0.27465	0.009582
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2167	632	0.29165	0.009764
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4682	587	0.12537	0.004839
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	519	0.74037	0.016559
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	507	0.72325	0.016898
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C34A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1868	0.07246	0.001615
C34B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1777	0.06893	0.001578
C34C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1773	0.06877	0.001576
C34D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1470	0.05702	0.001444
C34E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1976	0.07665	0.001657
C34F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2373	0.09205	0.001801
C34G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1455	0.05644	0.001437
C34H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1300	0.05043	0.001363
C34I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1303	0.05054	0.001364
C34J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2346	0.09100	0.001791
C34K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1318	0.05112	0.001372

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C34L	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1409	0.05465	0.001416
C35A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1276	0.04950	0.001351
C35A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1293	0.05016	0.001359
C35A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1293	0.05016	0.001359
C35A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1299	0.05039	0.001362
C35A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1302	0.05050	0.001364
C35A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1300	0.05043	0.001363
C35B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10608	540	0.05090	0.002134
C35B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8890	581	0.06535	0.002621
C35B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16173	662	0.04093	0.001558
C35B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10503	641	0.06103	0.002336
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3002	551	0.18354	0.007065
C35B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	9823	619	0.06302	0.002452
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3631	524	0.14431	0.005832
C35C2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	7275	618	0.08495	0.003269
C35C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	12452	746	0.05991	0.002127
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	5607	728	0.12984	0.004489
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1148	549	0.47822	0.014743
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2128	634	0.29793	0.009914
C36A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	754	0.02925	0.001049
C36B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	743	0.02882	0.001042
C36C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	721	0.02797	0.001027
C36D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	730	0.02832	0.001033
C37AA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	864	0.03351	0.001121
C37AB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	859	0.03332	0.001118
C37AC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	858	0.03328	0.001117
C37AD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	857	0.03324	0.001117
C37AE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	858	0.03328	0.001117
C37AF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	868	0.03367	0.001123
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2720	0.10551	0.001913
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2722	0.10559	0.001914
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2725	0.10570	0.001915
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2718	0.10543	0.001913
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2725	0.10570	0.001915
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2720	0.10551	0.001913
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2593	0.10058	0.001873
D39A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1117	0.04333	0.001268
D39B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1296	0.05027	0.001361
D39C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1213	0.04705	0.001319
D39D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1305	0.05062	0.001365
D39E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1681	0.06521	0.001538
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	4040	0.15671	0.002264
D40A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1427	0.05535	0.001424
D40B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1829	0.07095	0.001599

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	3519	0.13650	0.002138
D40D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2176	0.08441	0.001731
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5146	0.19961	0.002489
D40F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1445	0.05605	0.001433
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2926	0.11350	0.001976
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	7198	0.27921	0.002794
D40I	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	699	0.02711	0.001012
D41A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2153	0.08351	0.001723
D41B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1674	0.06493	0.001535
D41C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2358	0.09147	0.001795
D41D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2172	0.08425	0.001730
D41E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1894	0.07347	0.001625
D42	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	520	0.02017	0.000876
D43A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	891	0.03456	0.001138
D43B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1190	0.04616	0.001307
D43C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	947	0.03673	0.001172
D43D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1077	0.04178	0.001246
D43E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	935	0.03627	0.001164
D43F	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1281	0.04969	0.001353
D43G	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1263	0.04899	0.001344
D43H	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1135	0.04403	0.001278
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2939	0.11400	0.001979
D43J	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1036	0.04019	0.001223
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3380	0.13111	0.002102
D43L	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1256	0.04872	0.001341
D43M	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1284	0.04981	0.001355
D43N	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1179	0.04573	0.001301
D44	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	784	0.03041	0.001069
D45	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1337	0.05186	0.001381
D46	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	619	0.02401	0.000953
E47A	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2387	0.09259	0.001805
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	4617	0.17909	0.002388
E47C	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2246	0.08712	0.001756
E47D	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2219	0.08607	0.001747
E47E	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2199	0.08530	0.001740
E47F	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2205	0.08553	0.001742
E47G	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2224	0.08627	0.001749
E47H	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2212	0.08580	0.001744
E47I	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2220	0.08611	0.001747
E47J	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2216	0.08596	0.001746
E47K	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2213	0.08584	0.001745
E47L	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2220	0.08611	0.001747
E47M	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2218	0.08604	0.001746
E47N	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2226	0.08635	0.001749

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
E47O	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2206	0.08557	0.001742
E47P1	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P2	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P3	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P4	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P5	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P6	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P7	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P8	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P9	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1998	0.07750	0.001665
E48	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1017	0.03945	0.001212
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3428	0.13297	0.002115
E50	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1245	0.04829	0.001335
F51	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	10	0.00039	0.000123
F52A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	258	0.01001	0.000620
F52B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	277	0.01074	0.000642
F53A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	88	0.00341	0.000363
F53AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1224	63	0.05147	0.006316
F54	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	24558	63	0.00257	0.000323
F54AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1226	22	0.01794	0.003791
F55	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	597	0.02316	0.000937
F56A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	457	0.01773	0.000822
F56C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	3262	196	0.06009	0.004161
F57A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	148	0.00574	0.000471
F57C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1460	124	0.08493	0.007296
F58A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1681	0.06521	0.001538
F58B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1727	0.06699	0.001557
F59A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1529	0.05931	0.001471
F59B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1655	0.06420	0.001527
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3112	0.12071	0.002029
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2737	0.10617	0.001919
F59E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2185	0.08476	0.001735
F59F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2683	0.10407	0.001902
F59G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	998	0.03871	0.001201
F60A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1599	0.06202	0.001502
F60B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1719	0.06668	0.001554
F60C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1597	0.06195	0.001501
F60D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1505	0.05838	0.001460
F60E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1649	0.06396	0.001524
F60F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1622	0.06292	0.001512
F60G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1015	0.039372	0.001211
F60H	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1497	0.058068	0.001457
F60I	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1415	0.054888	0.001419

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	1071	0.10181	0.002948
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	738	0.12273	0.004232
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	603	0.10028	0.003874
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	389	0.14296	0.006710
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	313	0.11503	0.006117
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	4728	0.18340	0.002410
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5174	0.20070	0.002495
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5185	0.20112	0.002496
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5242	0.20334	0.002507
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5310	0.20597	0.002519
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5600	0.21722	0.002568
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5496	0.21319	0.002551
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5332	0.20683	0.002523
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	9617	0.69013	0.003917
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	10569	0.75845	0.003626
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4683	581	0.12407	0.004817
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2068	574	0.27756	0.009847
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	602	0.29082	0.009982
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	561	0.32057	0.011156
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	595	0.34000	0.011324
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	530	0.44500	0.014400
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1190	560	0.47059	0.014469
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	538	0.45748	0.014527
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	541	0.46003	0.014534
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	585	0.12489	0.004830
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	596	0.27465	0.009582
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2167	632	0.29165	0.009764
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4682	587	0.12537	0.004839
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	519	0.74037	0.016559
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	507	0.72325	0.016898
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3002	551	0.18354	0.007065
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3631	524	0.14431	0.005832
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	5607	728	0.12984	0.004489
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1148	549	0.47822	0.014743
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2128	634	0.29793	0.009914
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2720	0.10551	0.001913
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2722	0.10559	0.001914
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2725	0.10570	0.001915
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2718	0.10543	0.001913
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2725	0.10570	0.001915
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2720	0.10551	0.001913
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2593	0.10058	0.001873
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	4040	0.15671	0.002264
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	3519	0.13650	0.002138
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5146	0.19961	0.002489
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2926	0.11350	0.001976
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	7198	0.27921	0.002794

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2939	0.11400	0.001979
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3380	0.13111	0.002102
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	4617	0.17909	0.002388
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3428	0.13297	0.002115
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3112	0.12071	0.002029
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2737	0.10617	0.001919
F59F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2683	0.10407	0.001902

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
_1	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	7	0.000272	0.000103
F51	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	10	0.000388	0.000123
A4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	19	0.000737	0.000169
B16A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	28	0.001100	0.000208
C22A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	22823	31	0.001358	0.000244
B16A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	35	0.001602	0.000271
B16C1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	42	0.001650	0.000254
C28	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	57	0.002211	0.000293
F54	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	24558	63	0.002565	0.000323
B16A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	37	0.003069	0.000504
F53A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	88	0.003413	0.000363
C23A2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	75	0.003443	0.000397
C23A2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	79	0.003627	0.000407
B16C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	83	0.003798	0.000416
C23B2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	64	0.003969	0.000495
C23B2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	66	0.004093	0.000503
A9	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	143	0.005547	0.000463
F57A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	148	0.005741	0.000471
B16B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	132	0.006041	0.000524
A12A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	162	0.006284	0.000492
C23C2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	67	0.006369	0.000776
C23C2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	67	0.006369	0.000776
C23B2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	103	0.006388	0.000627
C23A2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	141	0.006473	0.000543
B16B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	79	0.006552	0.000735
B19A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	118	0.006580	0.000604
B16C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	87	0.007216	0.000771
B19C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	58	0.007931	0.001037
B19B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	99	0.008139	0.000815
A7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	213	0.008262	0.000564
B19B1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	104	0.008550	0.000835
A13A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	224	0.008689	0.000578
C22	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	228	0.008844	0.000583
B19B1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	109	0.008961	0.000854
B17	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	247	0.009581	0.000607
C23C2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	102	0.009696	0.000955
F52A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	258	0.010008	0.000620
B19A1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	182	0.010149	0.000748
B16B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	266	0.010450	0.000637
F52B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	277	0.010745	0.000642
B19A1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	193	0.010762	0.000771
_3	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	290	0.011249	0.000657
B16A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	27	0.011402	0.002182
B16B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	28	0.011824	0.002221

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23D2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	72	0.011974	0.001403
C23D2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	72	0.011974	0.001403
B19C1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	92	0.012580	0.001303
B16E2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	21851	289	0.013226	0.000773
B19C1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	103	0.014085	0.001378
B16E3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12057	174	0.014431	0.001086
C23D2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	89	0.014801	0.001557
B16E1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25454	377	0.014811	0.000757
C23B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	262	0.016249	0.000996
C23A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	368	0.016893	0.000873
F56A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	457	0.017727	0.000822
F54AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1226	22	0.017945	0.003791
B19A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	327	0.018235	0.000999
B16C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	44	0.018581	0.002775
C23A2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	405	0.018592	0.000915
C30	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	275	0.019734	0.001178
C23B2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	320	0.019846	0.001098
C23C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	212	0.020152	0.001370
D42	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	520	0.020171	0.000876
C23A2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	446	0.020474	0.000959
C23B2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	333	0.020652	0.001120
B19C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	152	0.020785	0.001668
B19C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	7313	161	0.022016	0.001716
C23C1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	237	0.022529	0.001447
C23B1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	370	0.022947	0.001179
F55	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	597	0.023157	0.000937
B19B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	285	0.023430	0.001372
C23C2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	249	0.023669	0.001482
B19B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	12164	288	0.023676	0.001379
D46	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	619	0.024011	0.000953
C23C2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	258	0.024525	0.001508
C23C2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	261	0.024810	0.001517
B20A7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	643	0.024942	0.000971
B20A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	644	0.024981	0.000972
B20A9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	644	0.024981	0.000972
B20A14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	645	0.025019	0.000973
B20A8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	646	0.025058	0.000973
B20A6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	647	0.025097	0.000974
B20A13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	647	0.025097	0.000974
C23A1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	547	0.025110	0.001060
B20A5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	648	0.025136	0.000975
B19A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	17933	451	0.025149	0.001169
B20A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	649	0.025175	0.000976
B20A12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	649	0.025175	0.000976

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B20A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	650	0.025213	0.000976
B20A10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	652	0.025291	0.000978
B20A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	657	0.025485	0.000982
B20A11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	659	0.025562	0.000983
C23D1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	156	0.025944	0.002050
C23D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	158	0.026276	0.002063
C23E2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	73	0.026828	0.003098
C23E2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	73	0.026828	0.003098
B20B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	693	0.026881	0.001007
B20B7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	695	0.026959	0.001009
B20B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	696	0.026998	0.001009
B20B9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	696	0.026998	0.001009
B20B14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	696	0.026998	0.001009
B20B12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	697	0.027036	0.001010
B20B13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	697	0.027036	0.001010
B20B8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	698	0.027075	0.001011
B20B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	699	0.027114	0.001012
B20B5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	699	0.027114	0.001012
B20B6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	699	0.027114	0.001012
D40I	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	699	0.027114	0.001012
B20B10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	702	0.027230	0.001014
B20B11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	704	0.027308	0.001015
B20B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	706	0.027386	0.001016
C21A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	717	0.027812	0.001024
C23B2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	449	0.027847	0.001296
C21A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	721	0.027967	0.001027
C21A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	721	0.027967	0.001027
C36C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	721	0.027967	0.001027
C21A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	722	0.028006	0.001028
C21A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	725	0.028123	0.001030
C21A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	730	0.028317	0.001033
C36D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	730	0.028317	0.001033
C36B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	743	0.028821	0.001042
C36A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	754	0.029247	0.001049
C23D2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	176	0.029270	0.002174
D44	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	784	0.030411	0.001069
C23D2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	186	0.030933	0.002233
B16E4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2368	74	0.031250	0.003576
B18C	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	322	0.031696	0.001738
_2	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	829	0.032157	0.001099
C23E2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	88	0.032341	0.003391
_1A	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	24331	797	0.032757	0.001141
C37AD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	857	0.033243	0.001117
C37AC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	858	0.033282	0.001117

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C37AE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	858	0.033282	0.001117
C37AB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	859	0.033320	0.001118
C37AA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	864	0.033514	0.001121
C37AF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	868	0.033670	0.001123
D43A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	891	0.034562	0.001138
C23D2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	212	0.035257	0.002378
C23A2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	776	0.035622	0.001256
D43E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	935	0.036268	0.001164
D43C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	947	0.036734	0.001172
B18A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	379	0.037307	0.001880
C21B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	965	0.037432	0.001182
C21B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	965	0.037432	0.001182
C21B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	965	0.037432	0.001182
C21B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	966	0.037471	0.001183
C21B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	966	0.037471	0.001183
C21B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	984	0.038169	0.001193
F59G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	998	0.038712	0.001201
C24E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	720	0.039037	0.001426
C24C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	724	0.039254	0.001430
C24A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	725	0.039308	0.001431
C23E3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	107	0.039324	0.003726
F60G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1015	0.039372	0.001211
E48	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1017	0.039449	0.001212
C24F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	730	0.039579	0.001436
C24G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	730	0.039579	0.001436
C24H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	731	0.039633	0.001437
C24B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	735	0.039850	0.001440
C24K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	738	0.040013	0.001443
C24D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	741	0.040176	0.001446
D43J	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1036	0.040186	0.001223
C24I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	743	0.040284	0.001448
C24J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18444	746	0.040447	0.001451
B15_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
B15_10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1049	0.040690	0.001231
C35B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16173	662	0.040932	0.001558
A11_1	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A11_2	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_3	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
A11_7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1056	0.040962	0.001234
C23E1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	112	0.041161	0.003808
C29	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	577	0.041407	0.001688
D43D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1077	0.041777	0.001246
D39A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1117	0.043328	0.001268
D43H	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1135	0.044026	0.001278
D43N	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1179	0.045733	0.001301
D43B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1190	0.046160	0.001307
B18B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	470	0.046264	0.002084
B14_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
B14_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1203	0.046664	0.001314
D39C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1213	0.047052	0.001319
C23E2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	130	0.047777	0.004089
E50	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1245	0.048293	0.001335
D43L	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1256	0.048720	0.001341
D43G	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1263	0.048991	0.001344
C35A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1276	0.049496	0.001351
D43F	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1281	0.049690	0.001353
D43M	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1284	0.049806	0.001355
B17A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	506	0.049808	0.002158
C23E2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	136	0.049982	0.004177
C35A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1293	0.050155	0.001359
C35A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1293	0.050155	0.001359
D39B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1296	0.050272	0.001361
C35A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1299	0.050388	0.001362
C34H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1300	0.050427	0.001363
C35A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1300	0.050427	0.001363
C35A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1302	0.050504	0.001364
C34I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1303	0.050543	0.001364
D39D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1305	0.050621	0.001365
C35B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10608	540	0.050905	0.002134
C23E2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	139	0.051084	0.004221
C34K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1318	0.051125	0.001372
C26	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1319	0.051164	0.001372
F53AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1224	63	0.051471	0.006316

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D45	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1337	0.051862	0.001381
B18	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10159	528	0.051974	0.002202
A7A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	9703	512	0.052767	0.002270
C34L	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1409	0.054655	0.001416
A5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1412	0.054771	0.001417
F60I	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1415	0.054888	0.001419
D40A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1427	0.055353	0.001424
D40F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1445	0.056051	0.001433
C34G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1455	0.056439	0.001437
C24	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21994	1247	0.056697	0.001559
C34D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1470	0.057021	0.001444
F60H	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1497	0.058068	0.001457
F60D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1505	0.058379	0.001460
A6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	25780	1526	0.059193	0.001470
F59A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1529	0.059310	0.001471
C35C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	12452	746	0.059910	0.002127
F56C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	3262	196	0.060086	0.004161
C23A2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	1326	0.060870	0.001620
A8	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	16212	989	0.061004	0.001880
C35B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10503	641	0.061030	0.002336
C27	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1591	0.061715	0.001499
F60C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1597	0.061947	0.001501
F60A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1599	0.062025	0.001502
F60F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1622	0.062917	0.001512
C35B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	9823	619	0.063015	0.002452
F60E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1649	0.063964	0.001524
F59B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1655	0.064197	0.001527
D41B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1674	0.064934	0.001535
D39E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1681	0.065206	0.001538
F58A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1681	0.065206	0.001538
C35B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8890	581	0.065354	0.002621
F60B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1719	0.066680	0.001554
F58B	F. Sociodem. Chars..	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1727	0.066990	0.001557
C34C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1773	0.068774	0.001576
C34B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1777	0.068929	0.001578
D40B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1829	0.070946	0.001599
A10	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	24780	1774	0.071590	0.001638
A4AB	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	540	0.071647	0.002971
C34A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1868	0.072459	0.001615
A4AC	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	547	0.072575	0.002988
A4AA	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	548	0.072708	0.002991
D41E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1894	0.073468	0.001625
A4AF	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	554	0.073504	0.003006
A4AD	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	556	0.073769	0.003011

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A4AE	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7537	556	0.073769	0.003011
C34E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	1976	0.076649	0.001657
C23B2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	1246	0.077276	0.002103
E47P9	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	1998	0.077502	0.001665
D41A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2153	0.083514	0.001723
D41D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2172	0.084251	0.001730
D40D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2176	0.084407	0.001731
F59E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2185	0.084756	0.001735
F57C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1460	124	0.084932	0.007296
C35C2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	7275	618	0.084948	0.003269
E47E	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2199	0.085299	0.001740
E47F	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2205	0.085531	0.001742
E47O	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2206	0.085570	0.001742
E47H	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2212	0.085803	0.001744
E47K	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2213	0.085842	0.001745
E47J	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2216	0.085958	0.001746
E47M	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2218	0.086036	0.001746
E47D	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2219	0.086074	0.001747
E47I	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2220	0.086113	0.001747
E47L	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2220	0.086113	0.001747
E47G	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2224	0.086268	0.001749
E47N	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2226	0.086346	0.001749
E47C	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2246	0.087122	0.001756
C34J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2346	0.091001	0.001791
D41C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2358	0.091466	0.001795
C34F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2373	0.092048	0.001801
E47A	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2387	0.092591	0.001805
C23B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	16124	1507	0.093463	0.002292
E47P1	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.094725	0.001824
E47P2	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.094725	0.001824
E47P3	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P4	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P5	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P6	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P7	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
E47P8	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2442	0.09472	0.001824
C23C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	1000	0.09506	0.002860
C23A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	21784	2122	0.09741	0.002009
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	603	0.10028	0.003874
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2593	0.10058	0.001873
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10520	1071	0.10181	0.002948
F59F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2683	0.10407	0.001902
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2718	0.10543	0.001913
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2720	0.10551	0.001913

1 Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2720	0.10551	0.001913
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2722	0.10559	0.001914
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2725	0.10570	0.001915
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2725	0.10570	0.001915
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2737	0.10617	0.001919
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	2926	0.11350	0.001976
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	2939	0.11400	0.001979
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	313	0.11503	0.006117
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3112	0.12071	0.002029
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	6013	738	0.12273	0.004232
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4683	581	0.12407	0.004817
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	584	0.12468	0.004827
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4684	585	0.12489	0.004830
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4682	587	0.12537	0.004839
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	5607	728	0.12984	0.004489
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3380	0.13111	0.002102
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	3428	0.13297	0.002115
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	3519	0.13650	0.002138
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2721	389	0.14296	0.006710
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3631	524	0.14431	0.005832
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	4040	0.15671	0.002264
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	25780	4617	0.17909	0.002388
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	4728	0.18340	0.002410
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3002	551	0.18354	0.007065
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5146	0.19961	0.002489
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5174	0.20070	0.002495
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5185	0.20112	0.002496
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5242	0.20334	0.002507
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5310	0.20597	0.002519
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5332	0.20683	0.002523
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5496	0.21319	0.002551
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	5600	0.21722	0.002568
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	566	0.26083	0.009426
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	579	0.26682	0.009495
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2170	596	0.27465	0.009582
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2068	574	0.27756	0.009847
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846

1. Faculty Questionnaire: TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2071	576	0.27813	0.009846
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	25780	7198	0.27921	0.002794
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	593	0.28647	0.009937
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2070	602	0.29082	0.009982
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2167	632	0.29165	0.009764
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2128	634	0.29793	0.009914
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	561	0.32057	0.011156
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1751	565	0.32267	0.011172
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	565	0.32286	0.011177
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1750	595	0.34000	0.011324
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	530	0.44500	0.014400
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	536	0.45004	0.014416
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	534	0.45408	0.014519
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	538	0.45748	0.014527
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1191	547	0.45928	0.014440
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	541	0.46003	0.014534
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1176	547	0.46514	0.014545
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1190	560	0.47059	0.014469
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1148	549	0.47822	0.014743
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	9617	0.69013	0.003917
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	501	0.71469	0.017055
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	507	0.72325	0.016898
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	513	0.73181	0.016732
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	701	519	0.74037	0.016559
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13935	10569	0.75845	0.003626

Item Nonresponse Rates: SAQ Respondents
Item Nonresponse Rates Greater Than 10 Percent (SAQ)
Item Nonresponse Rates for SAQ Respondents, Sorted by Rate

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
_1	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	5	0.000241	0.000108
_1A	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	19628	562	0.028633	0.001190
_2	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	755	0.036324	0.001298
_3	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	204	0.009815	0.000684
A4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	14	0.000674	0.000180
A4AA	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	330	0.055574	0.002973
A4AB	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	322	0.054227	0.002939
A4AC	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	328	0.055237	0.002965
A4AD	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	337	0.056753	0.003003
A4AE	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	337	0.056753	0.003003
A4AF	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	335	0.056416	0.002994
A5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	746	0.035891	0.001290
A6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	866	0.041665	0.001386
A7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	124	0.005966	0.000534
A7A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7974	421	0.052797	0.002504
A8	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	12914	569	0.044061	0.001806
A9	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	117	0.005629	0.000519
A10	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	19837	1077	0.054292	0.001609
A11_1	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_2	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_3	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A12A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	135	0.006495	0.000557
A13A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	190	0.009141	0.000660
B14_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B15_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B16A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	16	0.000779	0.000195
B16B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	240	0.011681	0.000750
B16C1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	38	0.001849	0.000300
B16E1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	326	0.015866	0.000872
B16A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	33	0.001801	0.000313
B16B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	123	0.006714	0.000603

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B16C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	79	0.004312	0.000484
B16E2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	261	0.014247	0.000876
B16A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	35	0.003405	0.000575
B16B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	76	0.007393	0.000845
B16C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	83	0.008074	0.000883
B16E3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	158	0.015370	0.001213
B16A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	26	0.012770	0.002488
B16B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	28	0.013752	0.002581
B16C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	44	0.021611	0.003223
B16E4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	64	0.031434	0.003867
B17	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	210	0.010103	0.000694
B17A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	437	0.053851	0.002506
B18	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	476	0.058657	0.002608
B18A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	318	0.039187	0.002154
B18B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	415	0.051140	0.002445
B18C	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	268	0.033025	0.001984
B19A1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	183	0.012485	0.000917
B19A1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	177	0.012075	0.000902
B19A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	112	0.007641	0.000719
B19A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	435	0.029677	0.001402
B19A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	312	0.021285	0.001192
B19B1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	101	0.009915	0.000982
B19B1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	98	0.009620	0.000967
B19B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	97	0.009522	0.000962
B19B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	282	0.027682	0.001625
B19B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	281	0.027584	0.001623
B19C1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	91	0.014754	0.001535
B19C1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	83	0.013457	0.001467
B19C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	56	0.009079	0.001208
B19C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	157	0.025454	0.002005
B19C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	148	0.023995	0.001949
B20A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	536	0.025788	0.001099
B20A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	543	0.026125	0.001106
B20A5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20A6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20A7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	543	0.026125	0.001106
B20A11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	548	0.026365	0.001111
B20A12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	542	0.026076	0.001105
B20A13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	541	0.026028	0.001104
B20A14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	585	0.028145	0.001147
B20B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	589	0.028338	0.001151
B20B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	588	0.028290	0.001150
B20B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	588	0.028290	0.001150

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B20B5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	591	0.028434	0.001153
B20B7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	592	0.028482	0.001154
B20B11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	592	0.028482	0.001154
B20B12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	589	0.028338	0.001151
B20B13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
C21A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	589	0.028338	0.001151
C21A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	613	0.029492	0.001173
C21A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	610	0.029348	0.001171
C21A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	612	0.029444	0.001173
C21A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	611	0.029396	0.001172
C21A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	617	0.029685	0.001177
C21B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	842	0.040510	0.001367
C21B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380
C21B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	859	0.041328	0.001381
C21B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380
C21B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380
C21B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380
C22	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	110	0.005292	0.000503
C22A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18297	27	0.001476	0.000284
C23A1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	524	0.029846	0.001284
C23A2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	376	0.021416	0.001093
C23A2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	596	0.033947	0.001367
C23A2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	339	0.019309	0.001039
C23A2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	67	0.003816	0.000465
C23A2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	108	0.006151	0.000590
C23A2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	64	0.003645	0.000455
C23A2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	1220	0.069488	0.001919
C23A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	306	0.017429	0.000988
C23A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	1547	0.088113	0.002139
C23B1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	359	0.027394	0.001426
C23B2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	292	0.022282	0.001289
C23B2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	356	0.027165	0.001420
C23B2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	281	0.021442	0.001265
C23B2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	59	0.004502	0.000585
C23B2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	83	0.006333	0.000693
C23B2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	57	0.004349	0.000575
C23B2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	1168	0.089126	0.002489
C23B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	227	0.017322	0.001140
C23B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	1134	0.086532	0.002456
C23C1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	225	0.026154	0.001721
C23C2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	225	0.026154	0.001721
C23C2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	217	0.025224	0.001691
C23C2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	233	0.027084	0.001750
C23C2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	59	0.006858	0.000890

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23C2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	82	0.00953	0.001048
C23C2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	59	0.00686	0.000890
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	1015	0.11798	0.003478
C23C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	182	0.02116	0.001551
C23C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	765	0.08892	0.003069
C23D1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	146	0.02933	0.002392
C23D2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	174	0.03496	0.002604
C23D2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	153	0.03074	0.002447
C23D2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	192	0.03858	0.002730
C23D2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	65	0.01306	0.001609
C23D2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	77	0.01547	0.001749
C23D2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	65	0.01306	0.001609
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	698	0.14025	0.004922
C23D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	140	0.02813	0.002344
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	483	0.09705	0.004196
C23E1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	104	0.04565	0.004373
C23E2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	125	0.05487	0.004771
C23E2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	119	0.05224	0.004662
C23E2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	126	0.05531	0.004789
C23E2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	67	0.02941	0.003540
C23E2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	79	0.03468	0.003834
C23E2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	67	0.02941	0.003540
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	365	0.16023	0.007686
C23E3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	95	0.04170	0.004188
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	259	0.11370	0.006651
C24	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17650	677	0.03836	0.001446
C24A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	461	0.03071	0.001408
C24B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	471	0.03138	0.001423
C24C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	460	0.03065	0.001407
C24D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	477	0.03178	0.001432
C24E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	456	0.03038	0.001401
C24F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	465	0.03098	0.001414
C24G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	465	0.03098	0.001414
C24H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	466	0.03105	0.001416
C24I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	478	0.03185	0.001433
C24J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	478	0.03185	0.001433
C24K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	470	0.03131	0.001422
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2074	0.09978	0.002079
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2514	0.12095	0.002262
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2525	0.12148	0.002266
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2585	0.12437	0.002289
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2613	0.12572	0.002300
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2913	0.14015	0.002408
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2807	0.13505	0.002371
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2666	0.12827	0.002319
C26	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	900	0.04330	0.001412
C27	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1094	0.05263	0.001549
C28	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	45	0.00217	0.000322
C29	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	555	0.04860	0.002012

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C30	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	253	0.02215	0.001377
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	7883	0.69028	0.004327
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	8715	0.76313	0.003978
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	456	0.11881	0.005223
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1747	496	0.28392	0.010788
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	519	0.29691	0.010928
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	488	0.33795	0.012448
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	511	0.35363	0.012577
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	466	0.46740	0.015801
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	483	0.48445	0.015828
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	475	0.47883	0.015861
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	473	0.47681	0.015858
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	460	0.11985	0.005243
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	524	0.28665	0.010576
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	537	0.29376	0.010653
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	462	0.12038	0.005252

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	458	0.77759	0.017135
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	444	0.75382	0.017750
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C34A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1232	0.05927	0.001638
C34B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1155	0.05557	0.001589
C34C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1143	0.05499	0.001581
C34D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	923	0.04441	0.001429
C34E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1170	0.05629	0.001599
C34F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1330	0.06399	0.001698
C34G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	932	0.04484	0.001435
C34H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	866	0.04166	0.001386
C34I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	848	0.04080	0.001372
C34J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1612	0.07756	0.001855
C34K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	868	0.04176	0.001388
C34L	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	924	0.04446	0.001430
C35A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	884	0.04253	0.001400
C35A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	901	0.04335	0.001413
C35A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	900	0.04330	0.001412
C35A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	907	0.04364	0.001417
C35A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	908	0.04369	0.001418
C35A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	908	0.04369	0.001418
C35B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8698	531	0.06105	0.002567
C35B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	7025	577	0.08214	0.003276
C35B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13563	655	0.04829	0.001841
C35B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8679	631	0.07270	0.002787
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2298	541	0.23542	0.008850
C35B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8332	612	0.07345	0.002858
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3042	521	0.17127	0.006831
C35C2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	5843	613	0.10491	0.004009
C35C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10511	740	0.07040	0.002495
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4743	720	0.15180	0.005210
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	979	543	0.55465	0.015884
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1883	627	0.33298	0.010861
C36A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	679	0.03267	0.001233
C36B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	673	0.03238	0.001228
C36C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	658	0.03166	0.001214
C36D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	665	0.03199	0.001221
C37AA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	763	0.03671	0.001304
C37AB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	758	0.03647	0.001300
C37AC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	757	0.03642	0.001299
C37AD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	757	0.03642	0.001299
C37AE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	757	0.03642	0.001299
C37AF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	765	0.03681	0.001306
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2604	0.12528	0.002296

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2608	0.12548	0.002298
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2611	0.12562	0.002299
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2605	0.12533	0.002297
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2610	0.12557	0.002298
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2606	0.12538	0.002297
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1517	0.07299	0.001804
D39A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	732	0.03522	0.001279
D39B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	907	0.04364	0.001417
D39C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	842	0.04051	0.001367
D39D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	928	0.04465	0.001433
D39E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1302	0.06264	0.001681
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	3658	0.17599	0.002641
D40A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	676	0.03252	0.001230
D40B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	962	0.04628	0.001457
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2259	0.10868	0.002159
D40D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1286	0.06187	0.001671
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	3774	0.18157	0.002674
D40F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	713	0.03430	0.001262
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1712	0.08237	0.001907
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	5222	0.25124	0.003008
D40I	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	574	0.02762	0.001137
D41A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1929	0.09281	0.002013
D41B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1423	0.06846	0.001752
D41C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2132	0.10257	0.002104
D41D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1928	0.09276	0.002012
D41E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1699	0.08174	0.001900
D42	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	394	0.01896	0.000946
D43A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	633	0.03045	0.001192
D43B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	881	0.04239	0.001397
D43C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	694.	0.03339	0.001246
D43D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	811	0.03902	0.001343
D43E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	676	0.03252	0.001230
D43F	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	861	0.04142	0.001382
D43G	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	867	0.04171	0.001387
D43H	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	823	0.03960	0.001353
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1848	0.08891	0.001974
D43J	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	765	0.03681	0.001306
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2055	0.09887	0.002070
D43L	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	915	0.04402	0.001423
D43M	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	899	0.04325	0.001411
D43N	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	895	0.04306	0.001408
D44	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	484	0.02329	0.001046
D45	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	762	0.03666	0.001304
D46	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	491	0.02362	0.001053
E47A	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1952	0.09391	0.002023
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	4022	0.19350	0.002740
E47C	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1876	0.09026	0.001988
E47D	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1858	0.08939	0.001979
E47E	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1850	0.08901	0.001975

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
E47F	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1851	0.08905	0.001976
E47G	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1865	0.08973	0.001982
E47H	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1860	0.08949	0.001980
E47I	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1862	0.08958	0.001981
E47J	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1861	0.08954	0.001980
E47K	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1859	0.08944	0.001979
E47L	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1868	0.08987	0.001984
E47M	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1862	0.08958	0.001981
E47N	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1867	0.08982	0.001983
E47O	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1861	0.08954	0.001980
E47P1	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P2	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P3	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P4	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P5	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P6	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P7	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P8	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P9	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1865	0.08973	0.001982
E48	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	904	0.04349	0.001415
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2663	0.12812	0.002318
E50	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1111	0.05345	0.001560
F51	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	5	0.00024	0.000108
F52A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	156	0.00751	0.000599
F52B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	152	0.00731	0.000591
F53A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	43	0.00207	0.000315
F53AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	947	57	0.06019	0.007729
F54	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	19840	29	0.00146	0.000271
F54AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	970	18	0.01856	0.004333
F55	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	480	0.02309	0.001042
F56A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	372	0.01790	0.000920
F56C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	2518	179	0.07109	0.005121
F57A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	89	0.00428	0.000453
F57C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1114	95	0.08528	0.008368
F58A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	949	0.04566	0.001448
F58B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	997	0.04797	0.001482
F59A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	765	0.03681	0.001306
F59B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	852	0.04099	0.001375
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1833	0.08819	0.001967
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1621	0.07799	0.001860
F59E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1215	0.05846	0.001627
F59F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1580	0.07602	0.001838
F59G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	696	0.03349	0.001248
F60A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	776	0.03733	0.001315
F60B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	843	0.04056	0.001368
F60C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	801	0.03854	0.001335
F60D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	736	0.03541	0.001282
F60E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	768	0.03695	0.001308
F60F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	805	0.03873	0.001338

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
F60G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	719	0.034592	0.001268
F60H	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	746	0.035891	0.001290
F60I	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	745	0.035843	0.001289

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	1015	0.11798	0.003478
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	698	0.14025	0.004922
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	365	0.16023	0.007686
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	259	0.11370	0.006651
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2514	0.12095	0.002262
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2525	0.12148	0.002266
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2585	0.12437	0.002289
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2613	0.12572	0.002300
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2913	0.14015	0.002408
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2807	0.13505	0.002371
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2666	0.12827	0.002319
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	7883	0.69028	0.004327
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	8715	0.76313	0.003978
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	456	0.11881	0.005223
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1747	496	0.28392	0.010788
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	519	0.29691	0.010928
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	488	0.33795	0.012448
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	511	0.35363	0.012577
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	466	0.46740	0.015801
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	483	0.48445	0.015828
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	475	0.47883	0.015861
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	473	0.47681	0.015858
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS

Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	460	0.11985	0.005243
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	524	0.28665	0.010576
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	537	0.29376	0.010653
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	462	0.12038	0.005252
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	458	0.77759	0.017135
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	444	0.75382	0.017750
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2298	541	0.23542	0.008850
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3042	521	0.17127	0.006831
C35C2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	5843	613	0.10491	0.004009
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4743	720	0.15180	0.005210
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	979	543	0.55465	0.015884
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1883	627	0.33298	0.010861
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2604	0.12528	0.002296
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2608	0.12548	0.002298
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2611	0.12562	0.002299
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2605	0.12533	0.002297
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2610	0.12557	0.002298
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2606	0.12538	0.002297
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	3658	0.17599	0.002641
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2259	0.10868	0.002159
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	3774	0.18157	0.002674
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	5222	0.25124	0.003008
D41C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2132	0.10257	0.002104
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	4022	0.19350	0.002740
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2663	0.12812	0.002318

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
_1	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	5	0.000241	0.000108
F51	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	5	0.000241	0.000108
A4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	14	0.000674	0.000180
B16A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	16	0.000779	0.000195
F54	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	19840	29	0.001462	0.000271
C22A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	18297	27	0.001476	0.000284
B16A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	33	0.001801	0.000313
B16C1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	38	0.001849	0.000300
F53A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	43	0.002069	0.000315
C28	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	45	0.002165	0.000322
B16A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	35	0.003405	0.000575
C23A2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	64	0.003645	0.000455
C23A2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	67	0.003816	0.000465
F57A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	89	0.004282	0.000453
B16C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	79	0.004312	0.000484
C23B2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	57	0.004349	0.000575
C23B2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	59	0.004502	0.000585
C22	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	110	0.005292	0.000503
A9	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	117	0.005629	0.000519
A7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	124	0.005966	0.000534
C23A2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	108	0.006151	0.000590
C23B2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	83	0.006333	0.000693
A12A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	135	0.006495	0.000557
B16B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	123	0.006714	0.000603
C23C2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	59	0.006858	0.000890
C23C2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	59	0.006858	0.000890
F52B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	152	0.007313	0.000591
B16B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	76	0.007393	0.000845
F52A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	156	0.007505	0.000599
B19A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	112	0.007641	0.000719
B16C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	83	0.008074	0.000883
B19C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	56	0.009079	0.001208
A13A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	190	0.009141	0.000660
B19B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	97	0.009522	0.000962
C23C2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	82	0.009532	0.001048
B19B1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	98	0.009620	0.000967
_3	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	204	0.009815	0.000684
B19B1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	101	0.009915	0.000982
B17	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	210	0.010103	0.000694
B16B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	240	0.011681	0.000750
B19A1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	177	0.012075	0.000902
B19A1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	183	0.012485	0.000917
B16A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	26	0.012770	0.002488
C23D2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	65	0.013060	0.001609
C23D2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	65	0.013060	0.001609
B19C1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	83	0.013457	0.001467
B16B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	28	0.013752	0.002581
B16E2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	18320	261	0.014247	0.000876
B19C1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	91	0.014754	0.001535

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B16E3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10280	158	0.015370	0.001213
C23D2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	77	0.015471	0.001749
B16E1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20547	326	0.015866	0.000872
C23B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	227	0.017322	0.001140
C23A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	306	0.017429	0.000988
F56A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	372	0.017898	0.000920
F54AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	970	18	0.018557	0.004333
D42	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	394	0.018956	0.000946
C23A2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	339	0.019309	0.001039
C23C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	182	0.021155	0.001551
B19A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	312	0.021285	0.001192
C23A2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	376	0.021416	0.001093
C23B2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	281	0.021442	0.001265
B16C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	44	0.021611	0.003223
C30	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	253	0.022154	0.001377
C23B2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	292	0.022282	0.001289
F55	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	480	0.023094	0.001042
D44	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	484	0.023286	0.001046
D46	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	491	0.023623	0.001053
B19C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	148	0.023995	0.001949
C23C2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	217	0.025224	0.001691
B19C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	6168	157	0.025454	0.002005
B20A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	536	0.025788	0.001099
B20A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	539	0.025932	0.001102
B20A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20A5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20A6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20A14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	540	0.025980	0.001103
B20A13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	541	0.026028	0.001104
B20A12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	542	0.026076	0.001105
B20A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	543	0.026125	0.001106
B20A10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	543	0.026125	0.001106
C23C1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	225	0.026154	0.001721
C23C2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	225	0.026154	0.001721
B20A11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	548	0.026365	0.001111
C23C2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	233	0.027084	0.001750
C23B2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	356	0.027165	0.001420
C23B1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	359	0.027394	0.001426
B19B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	281	0.027584	0.001623
D40I	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	574	0.027616	0.001137
B19B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	10187	282	0.027682	0.001625
C23D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	140	0.028129	0.002344
B20B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	585	0.028145	0.001147
B20B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	588	0.028290	0.001150
B20B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	588	0.028290	0.001150
B20B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	589	0.028338	0.001151

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N - number of eligible unit respondents
NR - number of item nonresponses
RATE - NR/N - item nonresponse rate
STDERR - standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B20B12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	589	0.028338	0.001151
C21A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	589	0.028338	0.001151
B20B5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	590	0.028386	0.001152
B20B6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	591	0.028434	0.001153
B20B10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	592	0.028482	0.001154
B20B11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	592	0.028482	0.001154
_1A	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	19628	562	0.028633	0.001190
C23D1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	146	0.029335	0.002392
C21A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	610	0.029348	0.001171
C21A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	611	0.029396	0.001172
C23E2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	67	0.029412	0.003540
C23E2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	67	0.029412	0.003540
C21A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	612	0.029444	0.001173
C21A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	613	0.029492	0.001173
B19A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	14658	435	0.029677	0.001402
C21A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	617	0.029685	0.001177
C23A1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	524	0.029846	0.001284
C24E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	456	0.030382	0.001401
D43A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	633	0.030455	0.001192
C24C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	460	0.030648	0.001407
C24A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	461	0.030715	0.001408
C23D2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	153	0.030741	0.002447
C24F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	465	0.030981	0.001414
C24G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	465	0.030981	0.001414
C24H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	466	0.031048	0.001416
C24K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	470	0.031315	0.001422
C24B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	471	0.031381	0.001423
B16E4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2036	64	0.031434	0.003867
C36C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	658	0.031657	0.001214
C24D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	477	0.031781	0.001432
B15_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
B15_10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	661	0.031802	0.001217
C24I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	478	0.031848	0.001433
C24J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	15009	478	0.031848	0.001433
C36D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	665	0.031994	0.001221
C36B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	673	0.032379	0.001228

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D40A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	676	0.032523	0.001230
D43E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	676	0.032523	0.001230
C36A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	679	0.032668	0.001233
B18C	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	268	0.033025	0.001984
D43C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	694	0.033389	0.001246
F59G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	696	0.033486	0.001248
C23A2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	596	0.033947	0.001367
D40F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	713	0.034304	0.001262
F60G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	719	0.034592	0.001268
C23E2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	79	0.034680	0.003834
C23D2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	174	0.034961	0.002604
D39A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	732	0.035218	0.001279
F60D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	736	0.035410	0.001282
F60I	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	745	0.035843	0.001289
A5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	746	0.035891	0.001290
F60H	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	746	0.035891	0.001290
_2	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	755	0.036324	0.001298
C37AC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	757	0.036420	0.001299
C37AD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	757	0.036420	0.001299
C37AE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	757	0.036420	0.001299
C37AB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	758	0.036469	0.001300
D45	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	762	0.036661	0.001304
C37AA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	763	0.036709	0.001304
C37AF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	765	0.036805	0.001306
D43J	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	765	0.036805	0.001306
F59A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	765	0.036805	0.001306
F60E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	768	0.036950	0.001308
F60A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	776	0.037335	0.001315
C24	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17650	677	0.038357	0.001446
F60C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	801	0.038537	0.001335
C23D2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	192	0.038577	0.002730
F60F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	805	0.038730	0.001338
B14_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
B14_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	806	0.038778	0.001339
D43D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	811	0.039019	0.001343
B18A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	318	0.039187	0.002154
D43H	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	823	0.039596	0.001353
C21B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	842	0.040510	0.001367
D39C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	842	0.040510	0.001367
F60B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	843	0.040558	0.001368
C34I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	848	0.040799	0.001372
F59B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	852	0.040991	0.001375
C21B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380
C21B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380
C21B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C21B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	858	0.041280	0.001380
C21B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	859	0.041328	0.001381
D43F	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	861	0.041424	0.001382
A6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	866	0.041665	0.001386
C34H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	866	0.041665	0.001386
C23E3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	95	0.041703	0.004188
D43G	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	867	0.041713	0.001387
C34K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	868	0.041761	0.001388
D43B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	881	0.042386	0.001397
C35A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	884	0.042531	0.001400
D43N	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	895	0.043060	0.001408
D43M	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	899	0.043252	0.001411
C26	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	900	0.043300	0.001412
C35A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	900	0.043300	0.001412
C35A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	901	0.043349	0.001413
E48	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	904	0.043493	0.001415
C35A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	907	0.043637	0.001417
D39B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	907	0.043637	0.001417
C35A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	908	0.043685	0.001418
C35A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	908	0.043685	0.001418
D43L	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	915	0.044022	0.001423
A8	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	12914	569	0.044061	0.001806
C34D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	923	0.044407	0.001429
C34L	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	924	0.044455	0.001430
D39D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	928	0.044648	0.001433
C34G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	932	0.044840	0.001435
C23E1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	104	0.045654	0.004373
F58A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	949	0.045658	0.001448
D40B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	962	0.046283	0.001457
A11_1	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_2	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_3	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
A11_7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	20785	987	0.047486	0.001475
F58B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	997	0.047967	0.001482
C35B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13563	655	0.048293	0.001841
C29	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	555	0.048599	0.002012
B18B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	415	0.051140	0.002445
C23E2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	119	0.052239	0.004662
C27	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1094	0.052634	0.001549
A7A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	7974	421	0.052797	0.002504
E50	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1111	0.053452	0.001560
B17A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	437	0.053851	0.002506
A4AB	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	322	0.054227	0.002939
A10	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	19837	1077	0.054292	0.001609
C23E2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	125	0.054873	0.004771
C34C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1143	0.054992	0.001581

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A4AC	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	328	0.055237	0.002965
C23E2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	126	0.055312	0.004789
C34B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1155	0.055569	0.001589
A4AA	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	330	0.055574	0.002973
C34E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1170	0.056291	0.001599
A4AF	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	335	0.056416	0.002994
A4AD	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	337	0.056753	0.003003
A4AE	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	5938	337	0.056753	0.003003
F59E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1215	0.058456	0.001627
B18	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	8115	476	0.058657	0.002608
C34A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1232	0.059274	0.001638
F53AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	947	57	0.060190	0.007729
C35B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8698	531	0.061049	0.002567
D40D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1286	0.061872	0.001671
D39E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1302	0.062641	0.001681
C34F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1330	0.063988	0.001698
D41B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1423	0.068463	0.001752
C23A2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	1220	0.069488	0.001919
C35C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	10511	740	0.070402	0.002495
F56C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	2518	179	0.071088	0.005121
C35B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8679	631	0.072704	0.002787
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1517	0.072985	0.001804
C35B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8332	612	0.073452	0.002858
F59F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1580	0.076016	0.001838
C34J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1612	0.077556	0.001855
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1621	0.077989	0.001860
D41E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1699	0.081742	0.001900
C35B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	7025	577	0.082135	0.003276
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	1712	0.082367	0.001907
F57C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	1114	95	0.085278	0.008368
C23B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	1134	0.086532	0.002456
C23A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	17557	1547	0.088113	0.002139
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1833	0.088189	0.001967
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1848	0.088910	0.001974
C23C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	765	0.088922	0.003069
E47E	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1850	0.089006	0.001975
E47F	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1851	0.089055	0.001976
C23B2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	13105	1168	0.089126	0.002489
E47D	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1858	0.089391	0.001979
E47K	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1859	0.089439	0.001979
E47H	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1860	0.089488	0.001980
E47J	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1861	0.089536	0.001980
E47O	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1861	0.089536	0.001980
E47I	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1862	0.089584	0.001981
E47M	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1862	0.089584	0.001981
E47G	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1865	0.089728	0.001982
E47P9	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1865	0.089728	0.001982
E47N	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1867	0.089824	0.001983
E47L	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1868	0.089873	0.001984

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
E47C	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1876	0.09026	0.001988
D41D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1928	0.09276	0.002012
D41A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1929	0.09281	0.002013
E47A	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1952	0.09391	0.002023
E47P1	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P2	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P3	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P4	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P5	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P6	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P7	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
E47P8	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	1993	0.09589	0.002042
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	483	0.09705	0.004196
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2055	0.09887	0.002070
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2074	0.09978	0.002079
D41C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2132	0.10257	0.002104
C35C2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	5843	613	0.10491	0.004009
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2259	0.10868	0.002159
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	259	0.11370	0.006651
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	8603	1015	0.11798	0.003478
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	456	0.11881	0.005223
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	459	0.11959	0.005238
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	460	0.11985	0.005243
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3838	462	0.12038	0.005252
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2514	0.12095	0.002262
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2525	0.12148	0.002266
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2585	0.12437	0.002289
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2604	0.12528	0.002296
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2605	0.12533	0.002297
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2606	0.12538	0.002297
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2608	0.12548	0.002298
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2610	0.12557	0.002298
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2611	0.12562	0.002299
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2613	0.12572	0.002300
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	2663	0.12812	0.002318
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2666	0.12827	0.002319
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2807	0.13505	0.002371
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	2913	0.14015	0.002408
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4977	698	0.14025	0.004922
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4743	720	0.15180	0.005210
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2278	365	0.16023	0.007686
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3042	521	0.17127	0.006831
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	3658	0.17599	0.002641
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	3774	0.18157	0.002674
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	20785	4022	0.19350	0.002740
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2298	541	0.23542	0.008850
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	20785	5222	0.25124	0.003008

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	500	0.27352	0.010426
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	515	0.28173	0.010521
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1747	496	0.28392	0.010788
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	524	0.28665	0.010576
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1749	513	0.29331	0.010886
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1828	537	0.29376	0.010653
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	519	0.29691	0.010928
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1748	533	0.30492	0.011011
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1883	627	0.33298	0.010861
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	488	0.33795	0.012448
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1444	500	0.34626	0.012520
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	504	0.34879	0.012537
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1445	511	0.35363	0.012577
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	466	0.46740	0.015801
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	474	0.47543	0.015816
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	473	0.47681	0.015858
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	475	0.47883	0.015861
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	478	0.48185	0.015865
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	483	0.48445	0.015828
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	997	485	0.48646	0.015829
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	992	487	0.49093	0.015872
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	979	543	0.55465	0.015884
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	7883	0.69028	0.004327
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	441	0.74873	0.017872
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	444	0.75382	0.017750
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	11420	8715	0.76313	0.003978
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319

1. Faculty Questionnaire: SAQ RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	454	0.77080	0.017319
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	458	0.77759	0.017135

Item Nonresponse Rates: CATI Respondents
Item Nonresponse Rates Greater Than 10 Percent (CATI)
Item Nonresponse Rates for CATI Respondents, Sorted by Rate

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
_1	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	2	0.00040	0.000283
_1A	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4703	235	0.04997	0.003177
_2	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	74	0.01481	0.001709
_3	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	86	0.01722	0.001841
A4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	5	0.00100	0.000447
A4AA	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	218	0.13634	0.008581
A4AB	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	218	0.13634	0.008581
A4AC	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AD	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AE	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AF	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	666	0.13333	0.004810
A6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	660	0.13213	0.004791
A7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	89	0.01782	0.001872
A7A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1729	91	0.05263	0.005370
A8	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	3298	420	0.12735	0.005805
A9	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	26	0.00521	0.001018
A10	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4943	697	0.14101	0.004950
A11_1	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.01381	0.001651
A11_2	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.01381	0.001651
A11_3	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.01381	0.001651
A11_4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.01381	0.001651
A11_5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.01381	0.001651
A11_6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.01381	0.001651
A11_7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.01381	0.001651
A12A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	27	0.00541	0.001037
A13A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	34	0.00681	0.001163
B14_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B15_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B15_10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.07768	0.003787
B16A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	12	0.00245	0.000705
B16B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	26	0.00530	0.001036
B16C1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	4	0.00082	0.000407
B16E1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	51	0.01039	0.001448
B16A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	2	0.00057	0.000400
B16B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	9	0.00255	0.000849

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B16C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	4	0.001133	0.000566
B16E2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	28	0.007930	0.001493
B16A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	2	0.001125	0.000795
B16B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	3	0.001688	0.000974
B16C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	4	0.002251	0.001124
B16E3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	16	0.009004	0.002241
B16A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	1	0.003012	0.003008
B16B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	0	0.000000	0.000000
B16C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	0	0.000000	0.000000
B16E4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	10	0.030120	0.009380
B17	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	37	0.007407	0.001213
B17A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	69	0.033757	0.003995
B18	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	52	0.025440	0.003483
B18A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	61	0.029843	0.003764
B18B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	55	0.026908	0.003579
B18C	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	54	0.026419	0.003547
B19A1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	10	0.003053	0.000964
B19A1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	5	0.001527	0.000682
B19A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	6	0.001832	0.000747
B19A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	16	0.004885	0.001218
B19A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	15	0.004580	0.001180
B19B1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	8	0.004047	0.001428
B19B1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	6	0.003035	0.001237
B19B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	2	0.001012	0.000715
B19B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	6	0.003035	0.001237
B19B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	4	0.002023	0.001011
B19C1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	12	0.010480	0.003010
B19C1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	9	0.007860	0.002610
B19C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	2	0.001747	0.001234
B19C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	4	0.003493	0.001744
B19C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	4	0.003493	0.001744
B20A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	121	0.024224	0.002175
B20A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	110	0.022022	0.002076
B20A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	104	0.020821	0.002020
B20A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
B20A6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	104	0.020821	0.002020
B20A8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.021021	0.002030
B20A10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	109	0.021822	0.002067
B20A11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	111	0.022222	0.002086
B20A12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	106	0.021221	0.002039
B20A14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.021021	0.002030
B20B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	121	0.024224	0.002175
B20B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	110	0.022022	0.002076
B20B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.021021	0.002030
B20B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B20B5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	109	0.02182	0.002067
B20B6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.02162	0.002058
B20B7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.02102	0.002030
B20B8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.02162	0.002058
B20B9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	106	0.02122	0.002039
B20B10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	110	0.02202	0.002076
B20B11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	112	0.02242	0.002095
B20B12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.02162	0.002058
B20B13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.02142	0.002049
B20B14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	106	0.02122	0.002039
C21A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	141	0.02823	0.002343
C21A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	108	0.02162	0.002058
C21A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.02142	0.002049
C21A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	109	0.02182	0.002067
C21A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	111	0.02222	0.002086
C21A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	108	0.02162	0.002058
C21B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	142	0.02843	0.002352
C21B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.02142	0.002049
C21B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.02142	0.002049
C21B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	108	0.02162	0.002058
C21B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.02142	0.002049
C21B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.02142	0.002049
C22	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	118	0.02362	0.002149
C22A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4526	4	0.00088	0.000442
C23A1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	23	0.00544	0.001131
C23A2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	70	0.01656	0.001963
C23A2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	180	0.04258	0.003106
C23A2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	66	0.01561	0.001907
C23A2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	12	0.00284	0.000818
C23A2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	33	0.00781	0.001354
C23A2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	11	0.00260	0.000784
C23A2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	106	0.02508	0.002405
C23A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	62	0.01467	0.001849
C23A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	575	0.13603	0.005273
C23B1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	11	0.00364	0.001097
C23B2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	41	0.01358	0.002106
C23B2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	93	0.03080	0.003145
C23B2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	39	0.01292	0.002055
C23B2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	7	0.00232	0.000875
C23B2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	20	0.00662	0.001476
C23B2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	7	0.00232	0.000875
C23B2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	78	0.02584	0.002887
C23B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	35	0.01159	0.001948
C23B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	373	0.12355	0.005989
C23C1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	12	0.00626	0.001801
C23C2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	24	0.01252	0.002539
C23C2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	44	0.02295	0.003420
C23C2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	25	0.01304	0.002591
C23C2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	8	0.00417	0.001472

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23C2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	20	0.01043	0.002321
C23C2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	8	0.00417	0.001472
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	56	0.02921	0.003846
C23C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	30	0.01565	0.002835
C23C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	235	0.12259	0.007491
C23D1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	10	0.00965	0.003038
C23D2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	12	0.01158	0.003324
C23D2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	23	0.02220	0.004578
C23D2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	20	0.01931	0.004275
C23D2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	7	0.00676	0.002545
C23D2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	12	0.01158	0.003324
C23D2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	7	0.00676	0.002545
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	40	0.03861	0.005986
C23D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	18	0.01737	0.004059
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	120	0.11583	0.009943
C23E1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	8	0.01806	0.006327
C23E2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	11	0.02483	0.007393
C23E2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	11	0.02483	0.007393
C23E2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	13	0.02935	0.008019
C23E2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	6	0.01354	0.005492
C23E2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	9	0.02032	0.006703
C23E2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	6	0.01354	0.005492
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	24	0.05418	0.010755
C23E3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	12	0.02709	0.007713
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	54	0.12190	0.015544
C24	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4344	570	0.13122	0.005123
C24A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.07686	0.004545
C24B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.07686	0.004545
C24C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.07686	0.004545
C24D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.07686	0.004545
C24E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.07686	0.004545
C24F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.07715	0.004553
C24G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.07715	0.004553
C24H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.07715	0.004553
C24I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.07715	0.004553
C24J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	268	0.07802	0.004576
C24K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	268	0.07802	0.004576
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2654	0.53133	0.007061
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2660	0.53253	0.007060
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2660	0.53253	0.007060
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2657	0.53193	0.007060
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2697	0.53994	0.007052
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2687	0.53794	0.007054
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2689	0.53834	0.007054
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2666	0.53373	0.007058
C26	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	419	0.08388	0.003922
C27	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	497	0.09950	0.004235
C28	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	12	0.00240	0.000693
C29	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	22	0.00875	0.001857

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C30	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	22	0.00875	0.001857
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	1734	0.68946	0.009227
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	1854	0.73718	0.008777
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	845	125	0.14793	0.012213
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	321	78	0.24299	0.023938
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	83	0.25776	0.024376
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	73	0.23856	0.024364
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	305	84	0.27541	0.025579
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	64	0.32990	0.033757
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	193	77	0.39896	0.035248
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	63	0.34239	0.034981
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	68	0.36957	0.035584
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	72	0.21053	0.022045
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	339	95	0.28024	0.024393
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	844	125	0.14810	0.012227

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	61	0.54464	0.047057
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	63	0.56250	0.046875
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C34A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	636	0.12733	0.004716
C34B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	622	0.12452	0.004672
C34C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	630	0.12613	0.004697
C34D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	547	0.10951	0.004418
C34E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	806	0.16136	0.005205
C34F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1043	0.20881	0.005751
C34G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	523	0.10470	0.004332
C34H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	434	0.08689	0.003985
C34I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	455	0.09109	0.004071
C34J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	734	0.14695	0.005010
C34K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	450	0.09009	0.004051
C34L	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	485	0.09710	0.004189
C35A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	393	0.07868	0.003809
C35A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	394	0.07888	0.003814
C35A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1910	9	0.00471	0.001567
C35B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1865	4	0.00214	0.001071
C35B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2610	7	0.00268	0.001012
C35B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1824	10	0.00548	0.001729
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	704	10	0.01420	0.004460
C35B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1491	7	0.00469	0.001770
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	3	0.00509	0.002933
C35C2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1432	5	0.00349	0.001559
C35C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1941	6	0.00309	0.001260
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	864	8	0.00926	0.003258
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	169	6	0.03550	0.014234
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	245	7	0.02857	0.010644
C36A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	75	0.01502	0.001721
C36B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	70	0.01401	0.001663
C36C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	63	0.01261	0.001579
C36D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	65	0.01301	0.001604
C37AA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.02022	0.001992
C37AB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.02022	0.001992
C37AC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.02022	0.001992
C37AD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	100	0.02002	0.001982
C37AE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.02022	0.001992
C37AF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	103	0.02062	0.002011
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	116	0.02322	0.002131

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS

Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	114	0.02282	0.002113
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	114	0.02282	0.002113
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	113	0.02262	0.002104
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	115	0.02302	0.002122
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	114	0.02282	0.002113
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1076	0.21542	0.005817
D39A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	385	0.07708	0.003774
D39B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	389	0.07788	0.003792
D39C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	371	0.07427	0.003710
D39D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	377	0.07548	0.003738
D39E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	379	0.07588	0.003747
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	382	0.07648	0.003760
D40A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	751	0.15035	0.005057
D40B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	867	0.17357	0.005359
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1260	0.25225	0.006145
D40D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	890	0.17818	0.005414
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1372	0.27467	0.006316
D40F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	732	0.14655	0.005004
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1214	0.24304	0.006069
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1976	0.39560	0.006919
D40I	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	125	0.02503	0.002210
D41A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	224	0.04484	0.002928
D41B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	251	0.05025	0.003091
D41C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	226	0.04525	0.002941
D41D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	244	0.04885	0.003050
D41E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	195	0.03904	0.002741
D42	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	126	0.02523	0.002219
D43A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	258	0.05165	0.003132
D43B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	309	0.06186	0.003409
D43C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	253	0.05065	0.003103
D43D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	266	0.05325	0.003177
D43E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	259	0.05185	0.003137
D43F	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	420	0.08408	0.003927
D43G	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	396	0.07928	0.003823
D43H	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	312	0.06246	0.003424
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1091	0.21842	0.005846
D43J	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	271	0.05425	0.003205
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1325	0.26527	0.006247
D43L	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	341	0.06827	0.003569
D43M	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	385	0.07708	0.003774
D43N	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	284	0.05686	0.003277
D44	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	300	0.06006	0.003362
D45	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	575	0.11512	0.004516
D46	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	128	0.02563	0.002236
E47A	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	435	0.08709	0.003990
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	595	0.11912	0.004583
E47C	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	370	0.07407	0.003706
E47D	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	361	0.07227	0.003664
E47E	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	349	0.06987	0.003607

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
E47F	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	354	0.07087	0.003631
E47G	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	359	0.07187	0.003654
E47H	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	352	0.07047	0.003621
E47I	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	358	0.07167	0.003650
E47J	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	355	0.07107	0.003636
E47K	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	354	0.07087	0.003631
E47L	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	352	0.07047	0.003621
E47M	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	356	0.07127	0.003640
E47N	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	359	0.07187	0.003654
E47O	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	345	0.06907	0.003588
E47P1	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P2	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P3	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P4	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P5	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P6	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P7	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P8	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P9	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	133	0.02663	0.002278
E48	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	113	0.02262	0.002104
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	765	0.15315	0.005096
E50	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	134	0.02683	0.002286
F51	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	5	0.00100	0.000447
F52A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	102	0.02042	0.002001
F52B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	125	0.02503	0.002210
F53A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	45	0.00901	0.001337
F53AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	277	6	0.02166	0.008747
F54	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4718	34	0.00721	0.001231
F54AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	256	4	0.01563	0.007751
F55	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	117	0.02342	0.002140
F56A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	85	0.01702	0.001830
F56C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	744	17	0.02285	0.005478
F57A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	59	0.01181	0.001529
F57C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	346	29	0.08382	0.014898
F58A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	732	0.14655	0.005004
F58B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	730	0.14615	0.004998
F59A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	764	0.15295	0.005093
F59B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	803	0.16076	0.005197
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1279	0.25606	0.006175
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1116	0.22342	0.005894
F59E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	970	0.19419	0.005597
F59F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1103	0.22082	0.005869
F59G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	302	0.06046	0.003372
F60A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	823	0.16476	0.005249
F60B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	876	0.17538	0.005381
F60C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	796	0.15936	0.005179
F60D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	769	0.15395	0.005107
F60E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	881	0.17638	0.005393
F60F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	817	0.16356	0.005233

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
F60G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	296	0.05926	0.003341
F60H	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	751	0.15035	0.005057
F60I	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	670	0.13413	0.004822

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS

Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A4AA	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	218	0.13634	0.008581
A4AB	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	218	0.13634	0.008581
A4AC	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AD	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AE	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AF	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	666	0.13333	0.004810
A6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	660	0.13213	0.004791
A8	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	3298	420	0.12735	0.005805
A10	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4943	697	0.14101	0.004950
C23A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	575	0.13603	0.005273
C23B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	373	0.12355	0.005989
C23C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	235	0.12259	0.007491
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	120	0.11583	0.009943
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	54	0.12190	0.015544
C24	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4344	570	0.13122	0.005123
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2654	0.53133	0.007061
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2660	0.53253	0.007060
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2660	0.53253	0.007060
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2657	0.53193	0.007060
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2697	0.53994	0.007052
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2687	0.53794	0.007054
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2689	0.53834	0.007054
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2666	0.53373	0.007058
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	1734	0.68946	0.009227
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	1854	0.73718	0.008777
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	845	125	0.14793	0.012213
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	321	78	0.24299	0.023938
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	83	0.25776	0.024376
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	73	0.23856	0.024364
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	305	84	0.27541	0.025579
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	64	0.32990	0.033757
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS

Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	193	77	0.39896	0.035248
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	63	0.34239	0.034981
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	68	0.36957	0.035584
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	72	0.21053	0.022045
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	339	95	0.28024	0.024393
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	844	125	0.14810	0.012227
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	61	0.54464	0.047057
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	63	0.56250	0.046875
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C34A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	636	0.12733	0.004716
C34B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	622	0.12452	0.004672
C34C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	630	0.12613	0.004697
C34D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	547	0.10951	0.004418
C34E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	806	0.16136	0.005205
C34F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1043	0.20881	0.005751
C34G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	523	0.10470	0.004332
C34J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	734	0.14695	0.005010
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1076	0.21542	0.005817
D40A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	751	0.15035	0.005057
D40B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	867	0.17357	0.005359
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1260	0.25225	0.006145
D40D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	890	0.17818	0.005414
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1372	0.27467	0.006316
D40F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	732	0.14655	0.005004
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1214	0.24304	0.006069

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1976	0.39560	0.006919
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1091	0.21842	0.005846
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1325	0.26527	0.006247
D45	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	575	0.11512	0.004516
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	595	0.11912	0.004583
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	765	0.15315	0.005096
F58A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	732	0.14655	0.005004
F58B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	730	0.14615	0.004998
F59A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	764	0.15295	0.005093
F59B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	803	0.16076	0.005197
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1279	0.25606	0.006175
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1116	0.22342	0.005894
F59E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	970	0.19419	0.005597
F59F	F. Sociodem, Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1103	0.22082	0.005869
F60A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	823	0.16476	0.005249
F60B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	876	0.17538	0.005381
F60C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	796	0.15936	0.005179
F60D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	769	0.15395	0.005107
F60E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	881	0.17638	0.005393
F60F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	817	0.16356	0.005233
F60H	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	751	0.15035	0.005057
F60I	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	670	0.13413	0.004822

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B16B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	0	.0000000	0.000000
B16C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	0	.0000000	0.000000
_1	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	2	.0004004	0.000283
B16A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	2	.0005664	0.000400
B16C1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	4	.0008152	0.000407
C22A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4526	4	.0008838	0.000442
A4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	5	.0010010	0.000447
F51	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	5	.0010010	0.000447
B19B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	2	.0010116	0.000715
B16A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	2	.0011255	0.000795
B16C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	4	.0011328	0.000566
B19A1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	5	.0015267	0.000682
B16B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	3	.0016882	0.000974
B19C2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	2	.0017467	0.001234
B19A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	6	.0018321	0.000747
B19B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	4	.0020233	0.001011
C35B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1865	4	.0021448	0.001071
B16C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	4	.0022510	0.001124
C23B2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	7	.0023186	0.000875
C23B2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	7	.0023186	0.000875
C28	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	12	.0024024	0.000693
B16A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	12	.0024455	0.000705
B16B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	9	.0025489	0.000849
C23A2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	11	.0026023	0.000784
C35B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2610	7	.0026820	0.001012
C23A2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	12	.0028389	0.000818
B16A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	1	.0030120	0.003008
B19B1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	6	.0030349	0.001237
B19B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	6	.0030349	0.001237
B19A1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	10	.0030534	0.000964
C35C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1941	6	.0030912	0.001260
C35C2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1432	5	.0034916	0.001559
B19C3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	4	.0034934	0.001744
B19C4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	4	.0034934	0.001744
C23B1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	11	.0036436	0.001097
B19B1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1977	8	.0040465	0.001428
C23C2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	8	.0041732	0.001472
C23C2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	8	.0041732	0.001472
B19A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	15	.0045802	0.001180
C35B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1491	7	.0046948	0.001770
C35B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1910	9	.0047120	0.001567
B19A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3275	16	.0048855	0.001218
C35C1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	589	3	.0050934	0.002933
A9	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	26	.0052052	0.001018
B16B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	26	.0052986	0.001036
A12A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	27	.0054054	0.001037
C23A1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	23	.0054412	0.001131
C35B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1824	10	.0054825	0.001729
C23C1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	12	.0062598	0.001801

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23B2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	20	0.006625	0.001476
C23D2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	7	0.006757	0.002545
C23D2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	7	0.006757	0.002545
A13A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	34	0.006807	0.001163
F54	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4718	34	0.007206	0.001231
B17	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	37	0.007407	0.001213
C23A2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	33	0.007807	0.001354
B19C1B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	9	0.007860	0.002610
B16E2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	3531	28	0.007930	0.001493
C29	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	22	0.008748	0.001857
C30	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	22	0.008748	0.001857
B16E3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1777	16	0.009004	0.002241
F53A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	45	0.009009	0.001337
C35C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	864	8	0.009259	0.003258
C23D1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	10	0.009653	0.003038
B16E1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4907	51	0.010393	0.001448
C23C2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	20	0.010433	0.002321
B19C1A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	1145	12	0.010480	0.003010
C23D2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	12	0.011583	0.003324
C23D2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	12	0.011583	0.003324
C23B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	35	0.011593	0.001948
F57A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	59	0.011812	0.001529
C23C2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	24	0.012520	0.002539
C36C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	63	0.012613	0.001579
C23B2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	39	0.012918	0.002055
C36D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	65	0.013013	0.001604
C23C2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	25	0.013041	0.002591
C23E2D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	6	0.013544	0.005492
C23E2F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	6	0.013544	0.005492
C23B2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	41	0.013581	0.002106
A11_1	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.013814	0.001651
A11_2	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.013814	0.001651
A11_3	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.013814	0.001651
A11_4	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.013814	0.001651
A11_5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.013814	0.001651
A11_6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.013814	0.001651
A11_7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	69	0.013814	0.001651
C36B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	70	0.014014	0.001663
C35B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	704	10	0.014205	0.004460
C23A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	62	0.014668	0.001849
_2	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	74	0.014815	0.001709
C36A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	75	0.015015	0.001721
C23A2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	66	0.015614	0.001907
F54AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	256	4	0.015625	0.007751
C23C3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	30	0.015649	0.002835
C23A2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	70	0.016560	0.001963
F56A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	85	0.017017	0.001830
_3	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	86	0.017217	0.001841
C23D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	18	0.017375	0.004059

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A7	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	89	0.017818	0.001872
C23E1B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	8	0.018059	0.006327
C23D2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	20	0.019305	0.004275
C37AD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	100	0.020020	0.001982
C37AA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.020220	0.001992
C37AB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.020220	0.001992
C37AC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.020220	0.001992
C37AE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	101	0.020220	0.001992
C23E2E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	9	0.020316	0.006703
F52A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	102	0.020420	0.002001
C37AF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	103	0.020621	0.002011
B20A3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	104	0.020821	0.002020
B20A7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	104	0.020821	0.002020
B20A9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.021021	0.002030
B20A14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.021021	0.002030
B20B3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.021021	0.002030
B20B7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	105	0.021021	0.002030
B20A13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	106	0.021221	0.002039
B20B9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	106	0.021221	0.002039
B20B14	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	106	0.021221	0.002039
B20A4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20B13	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
C21A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
C21B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
C21B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
C21B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
C21B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	107	0.021421	0.002049
B20A5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
B20B4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
B20B6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
B20B8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
B20B12	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
C21A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
C21A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
C21B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	108	0.021622	0.002058
F53AA	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	277	6	0.021661	0.008747
B20A10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	109	0.021822	0.002067
B20B5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	109	0.021822	0.002067
C21A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	109	0.021822	0.002067
B20A2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	110	0.022022	0.002076
B20B2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	110	0.022022	0.002076
B20B10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	110	0.022022	0.002076
C23D2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	23	0.022201	0.004578
B20A11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	111	0.022222	0.002086
C21A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	111	0.022222	0.002086
B20B11	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	112	0.022422	0.002095

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C37BD	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	113	0.022623	0.002104
E48	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	113	0.022623	0.002104
C37BB	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	114	0.022823	0.002113
C37BC	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	114	0.022823	0.002113
C37BF	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	114	0.022823	0.002113
F56C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	744	17	0.022849	0.005478
C23C2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	44	0.022953	0.003420
C37BE	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	115	0.023023	0.002122
C37BA	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	116	0.023223	0.002131
F55	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	117	0.023423	0.002140
C22	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	118	0.023624	0.002149
B20A1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	121	0.024224	0.002175
B20B1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	121	0.024224	0.002175
C23E2A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	11	0.024831	0.007393
C23E2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	11	0.024831	0.007393
D40I	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	125	0.025025	0.002210
F52B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	125	0.025025	0.002210
C23A2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	106	0.025077	0.002405
D42	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	126	0.025225	0.002219
B18	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	52	0.025440	0.003483
D46	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	128	0.025626	0.002236
C23B2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	78	0.025836	0.002887
B18C	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	54	0.026419	0.003547
E47P9	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	133	0.026627	0.002278
E50	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	134	0.026827	0.002286
B18B	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	55	0.026908	0.003579
C23E3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	12	0.027088	0.007713
C21A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	141	0.028228	0.002343
C21B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	142	0.028428	0.002352
C35C6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	245	7	0.028571	0.010644
C23C2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	56	0.029212	0.003846
C23E2C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	13	0.029345	0.008019
B18A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	61	0.029843	0.003764
B16E4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	332	10	0.030120	0.009380
C23B2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	93	0.030805	0.003145
B17A	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	2044	69	0.033757	0.003995
C35C5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	169	6	0.035503	0.014234
C23D2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	40	0.038610	0.005986
D41E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	195	0.039039	0.002741
C23A2B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	180	0.042583	0.003106
D41A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	224	0.044845	0.002928
D41C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	226	0.045245	0.002941
D41D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	244	0.048849	0.003050
_1A	0. Preface	1. Q1 - Q20	4703	235	0.049968	0.003177
D41B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	251	0.050250	0.003091
D43C	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	253	0.050651	0.003103
D43A	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	258	0.051652	0.003132
D43E	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	259	0.051852	0.003137
A7A	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1729	91	0.052632	0.005370

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D43D	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	266	0.053253	0.003177
C23E2G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	24	0.054176	0.010755
D43J	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	271	0.054254	0.003205
D43N	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	284	0.056857	0.003277
F60G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	296	0.059259	0.003341
D44	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	300	0.060060	0.003362
F59G	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	302	0.060460	0.003372
D43B	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	309	0.061862	0.003409
D43H	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	312	0.062462	0.003424
D43L	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	341	0.068268	0.003569
E47O	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	345	0.069069	0.003588
E47E	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	349	0.069870	0.003607
E47H	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	352	0.070470	0.003621
E47L	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	352	0.070470	0.003621
E47F	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	354	0.070871	0.003631
E47K	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	354	0.070871	0.003631
E47J	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	355	0.071071	0.003636
E47M	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	356	0.071271	0.003640
E47I	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	358	0.071672	0.003650
E47G	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	359	0.071872	0.003654
E47N	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	359	0.071872	0.003654
E47D	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	361	0.072272	0.003664
E47C	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	370	0.074074	0.003706
D39C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	371	0.074274	0.003710
D39D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	377	0.075475	0.003738
D39E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	379	0.075876	0.003747
D39F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	382	0.076476	0.003760
C24A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.076856	0.004545
C24B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.076856	0.004545
C24C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.076856	0.004545
C24D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.076856	0.004545
C24E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	264	0.076856	0.004545
D39A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	385	0.077077	0.003774
D43M	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	385	0.077077	0.003774
C24F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.077147	0.004553
C24G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.077147	0.004553
C24H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.077147	0.004553
C24I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	265	0.077147	0.004553
B15_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_7	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_8	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_9	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
B15_10	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	388	0.077678	0.003787
D39B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	389	0.077878	0.003792

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C24J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	268	0.07802	0.004576
C24K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3435	268	0.07802	0.004576
C35A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	392	0.07848	0.003805
C35A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	393	0.07868	0.003809
C35A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	394	0.07888	0.003814
D43G	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	396	0.07928	0.003823
B14_1	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_2	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_3	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_4	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_5	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
B14_6	B. Prof. Background	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	397	0.07948	0.003827
F57C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	346	29	0.08382	0.014898
C26	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	419	0.08388	0.003922
D43F	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	420	0.08408	0.003927
C34H	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	434	0.08689	0.003985
E47A	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	435	0.08709	0.003990
E47P1	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P2	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P3	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P4	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P5	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P6	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P7	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
E47P8	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	449	0.08989	0.004047
C34K	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	450	0.09009	0.004051
C34I	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	455	0.09109	0.004071
C34L	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	485	0.09710	0.004189
C27	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	497	0.09950	0.004235
C34G	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	523	0.10470	0.004332
C34D	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	547	0.10951	0.004418
D45	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	575	0.11512	0.004516
C23D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1036	120	0.11583	0.009943
E47B	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	595	0.11912	0.004583
C23E4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	443	54	0.12190	0.015544
C23C4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	1917	235	0.12259	0.007491
C23B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	3019	373	0.12355	0.005989
C34B	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	622	0.12452	0.004672
C34C	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	630	0.12613	0.004697
C34A	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	636	0.12733	0.004716
A8	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	3298	420	0.12735	0.005805
C24	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4344	570	0.13122	0.005123
A6	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	660	0.13213	0.004791
A5	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4995	666	0.13333	0.004810
F60I	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	670	0.13413	0.004822
C23A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4227	575	0.13603	0.005273

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A4AA	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	218	0.13634	0.008581
A4AB	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	218	0.13634	0.008581
A4AC	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AD	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AE	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A4AF	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	1599	219	0.13696	0.008598
A10	A. Employment	1. Q1 - Q20	4943	697	0.14101	0.004950
F58B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	730	0.14615	0.004998
D40F	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	732	0.14655	0.005004
F58A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	732	0.14655	0.005004
C34J	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	734	0.14695	0.005010
C33A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33A5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	846	125	0.14775	0.012200
C33A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	845	125	0.14793	0.012213
C33A6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	844	125	0.14810	0.012227
D40A	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	751	0.15035	0.005057
F60H	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	751	0.15035	0.005057
F59A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	764	0.15295	0.005093
E49	E. Compensation	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	765	0.15315	0.005096
F60D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	769	0.15395	0.005107
F60C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	796	0.15936	0.005179
F59B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	803	0.16076	0.005197
C34E	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	806	0.16136	0.005205
F60F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	817	0.16356	0.005233
F60A	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	823	0.16476	0.005249
D40B	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	867	0.17357	0.005359
F60B	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	876	0.17538	0.005381
F60E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	881	0.17638	0.005393
D40D	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	890	0.17818	0.005414
C33C1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33C1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33C1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	60	0.18634	0.021699
C33E5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33E5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33E5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	64	0.18713	0.021090
C33C5_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33C5_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
C33C5_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	66	0.19298	0.021340
F59E	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	970	0.19419	0.005597
C33E1_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33E1_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33E1_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	63	0.19565	0.022107
C33E2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33E2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C33E2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	61	0.19935	0.022838
C34F	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1043	0.20881	0.005751
C33B5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	342	72	0.21053	0.022045

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N - number of eligible unit respondents
NR - number of item nonresponses
RATE - NR/N - item nonresponse rate
STDERR - standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33C2_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33C2_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C33C2_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	65	0.21242	0.023382
C38	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1076	0.21542	0.005817
D43I	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1091	0.21842	0.005846
F59F	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1103	0.22082	0.005869
F59D	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1116	0.22342	0.005894
C33B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	306	73	0.23856	0.024364
C33B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	321	78	0.24299	0.023938
D40G	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1214	0.24304	0.006069
D40C	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1260	0.25225	0.006145
F59C	F. Sociodem. Chars.	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1279	0.25606	0.006175
C33D1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	322	83	0.25776	0.024376
D43K	D. Job Satisfaction	3. Q41 - Q60	4995	1325	0.26527	0.006247
D40E	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1372	0.27467	0.006316
C33D2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	305	84	0.27541	0.025579
C33D5	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	339	95	0.28024	0.024393
C33E4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33E4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33E4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	56	0.30435	0.033921
C33C3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33C3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33C3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33E3_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33E3_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33E3_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	62	0.31959	0.033480
C33C4_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33C4_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33C4_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	60	0.32609	0.034559
C33B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	194	64	0.32990	0.033757
C33B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	63	0.34239	0.034981
C33D4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	184	68	0.36957	0.035584
D40H	D. Job Satisfaction	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	1976	0.39560	0.006919
C33D3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	193	77	0.39896	0.035248
C33C6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33C6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C33C6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	59	0.52679	0.047178
C25A1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2654	0.53133	0.007061
C25A4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2657	0.53193	0.007060
C25A2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2660	0.53253	0.007060
C25A3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2660	0.53253	0.007060
C25B4	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2666	0.53373	0.007058
C33E6_1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C33E6_2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C33E6_3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	60	0.53571	0.047125
C25B2	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2687	0.53794	0.007054
C25B3	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2689	0.53834	0.007054
C25B1	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	4995	2697	0.53994	0.007052
C33B6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	61	0.54464	0.047057

1. Faculty Questionnaire: CATI RESPONDENTS
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C33D6	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	112	63	0.56250	0.046875
C31	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	1734	0.68946	0.009227
C32	C. Resp./Workload	2. Q21 - Q40	2515	1854	0.73718	0.008777

Appendix J

Critical Items and Nonresponse: 1993 NSOPF Institution Questionnaire

Item Nonresponse Rates, Critical Items

Item Nonresponse Rates, Total Respondents

Item Nonresponse Rates, Greater Than 20 Percent

Item Nonresponse Rates, Greater Than 10 Percent

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by Rate

Item Nonresponse Rates, Critical Items

NSOPF-93 Critical Items

Institution Questionnaire

A1A	Current percentage of full-time instructional faculty/staff
A1B	Current percentage of part-time instructional faculty/staff
A1C	Current percentage of full-time non-instructional faculty/staff
A1D	Current percentage of full-time non-instructional faculty/staff
B2A	Current total permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff
B2B	Current total permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff hired in last year
B2C	No. of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff who retired in last year
B2D	No. of permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff downsized in the last yr.
B2E	No. of perm. full-time instr. faculty/staff who left for any reason in last year
B2F	Total permanent full-time instructional faculty/staff one year ago
B6A	Current number of tenured faculty
B6B	Current number of tenure-track faculty
B6C	Tenured faculty one year ago
B14	Average percentage of instructional faculty/staff salary contributed to benefits
C30	Avg. percentage of non-instructional faculty/staff salary contributed to benefits

1. Institution Questionnaire: CRITICAL ITEMS

Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A1A	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	0	0.000000	0.000000
A1B	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	10	0.011468	0.003606
A1C	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	13	0.014908	0.004104
A1D	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	26	0.029817	0.005760
B2A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	0	0.000000	0.000000
B2B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	46	0.052813	0.007578
B2C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	51	0.058553	0.007955
B2D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	51	0.058553	0.007955
B2E	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	64	0.073479	0.008841
B2F	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	29	0.033295	0.006079
B6A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	16	0.022039	0.005449
B6B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	28	0.038567	0.007147
B6C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	32	0.044077	0.007618
B14	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	36	0.041332	0.006745
C30	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	557	32	0.057451	0.009860

Item Nonresponse Rates, Total Respondents

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
AC1	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	65	0.07454	0.008894
AC2	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	53	0.06078	0.008091
AC3	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	82	0.09404	0.009884
AC4	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	47	0.05390	0.007647
AC5	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	177	0.20298	0.013621
AC6	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	172	0.19725	0.013475
A1A	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	0	0.00000	0.000000
A1B	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	10	0.01147	0.003606
A1C	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	13	0.01491	0.004104
A1D	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	26	0.02982	0.005760
B2A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	0	0.00000	0.000000
B2B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	46	0.05281	0.007578
B2C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	51	0.05855	0.007955
B2D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	51	0.05855	0.007955
B2E	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	64	0.07348	0.008841
B2F	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	29	0.03330	0.006079
B3	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	121	0.13892	0.011719
B4	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	50	0.05741	0.007882
B4A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	288	89	0.30903	0.027229
B5	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	0	0.00000	0.000000
B6A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	16	0.02204	0.005449
B6B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	28	0.03857	0.007147
B6C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	32	0.04408	0.007618
B6D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	45	0.06198	0.008949
B7A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	56	0.07713	0.009902
B7B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	42	0.05785	0.008665
B7C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	89	0.12259	0.012172
B8A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	86	0.11846	0.011993
B8B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	60	0.08264	0.010219
B9A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	35	0.04821	0.007950
B9B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	37	0.05096	0.008162
B10A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	19	0.02617	0.005925
B10B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	18	0.02479	0.005771
B10C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	22	0.03030	0.006362
B11	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	16	0.01837	0.004550
B11A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	498	85	0.17068	0.016859
B12A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	10	0.01148	0.003610
B12A1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	654	25	0.03823	0.007498
B12B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	14	0.01607	0.004261
B12B1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	493	17	0.03448	0.008218
B12C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	13	0.01493	0.004109
B12C1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	534	34	0.06367	0.010566
B12D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	13	0.01493	0.004109
B12D1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	150	20	0.13333	0.027756

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B12E	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	12	0.01378	0.003950
B12E1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	258	19	0.07364	0.016261
B13A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.00574	0.002560
B13A1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	460	13	0.02826	0.007727
B13B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.00689	0.002803
B13B1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	866	44	0.05081	0.007463
B13C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.00689	0.002803
B13C1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	775	30	0.03871	0.006929
B13D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.00574	0.002560
B13D1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	807	38	0.04709	0.007457
B13E	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.00574	0.002560
B13E1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	834	49	0.05875	0.008143
B13F	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.00689	0.002803
B13F1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	523	24	0.04589	0.009150
B13G	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.00574	0.002560
B13G1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	538	24	0.04461	0.008900
B13H	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.00574	0.002560
B13H1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	342	8	0.02339	0.008173
B13I	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.00689	0.002803
B13I1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	102	9	0.08824	0.028084
B13J	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.00574	0.002560
B13J1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	119	8	0.06723	0.022955
B13K	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	7	0.00804	0.003025
B13K1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	568	16	0.02817	0.006942
B13L	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	7	0.00804	0.003025
B13L1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	771	60	0.07782	0.009648
B13M	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.00689	0.002803
B13M1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	614	45	0.07329	0.010517
B13N	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	7	0.00804	0.003025
B13N1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	698	47	0.06734	0.009485
B13O	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.00689	0.002803
B13O1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	237	27	0.11392	0.020638
B14	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	36	0.04133	0.006745
B15	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	26	0.02985	0.005766
B16A	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	9	0.01568	0.005185
B16A1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	308	11	0.03571	0.010574
B16B	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.01394	0.004893
B16B1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	504	28	0.05556	0.010203
B16C	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	10	0.01742	0.005461
B16C1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	436	23	0.05275	0.010706
B16D	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	12	0.02091	0.005972
B16D1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	413	27	0.06538	0.012163
B16E	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	12	0.02091	0.005972
B16E1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	430	34	0.07907	0.013013

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B16F	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.01394	0.004893
B16F1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	238	19	0.07983	0.017568
B16G	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.01394	0.004893
B16G1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	232	18	0.07759	0.017564
B16H	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.01394	0.004893
B16H1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	236	9	0.03814	0.012467
B16I	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.01394	0.004893
B16I1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	41	10	0.24390	0.067066
B16J	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	7	0.01220	0.004581
B16J1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	68	9	0.13235	0.041095
B16K	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	7	0.01220	0.004581
B16K1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	391	19	0.04859	0.010874
B16L	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	15	0.02613	0.006659
B16L1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	369	40	0.10840	0.016184
B16M	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	16	0.02787	0.006871
B16M1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	325	35	0.10769	0.017195
B16N	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	16	0.02787	0.006871
B16N1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	252	30	0.11905	0.020400
B16O	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	7	0.01220	0.004581
B16O1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	118	20	0.16949	0.034539
B17	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	77	0.08840	0.009619
B18A	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	21	0.02411	0.005197
B18B	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	88	0.10103	0.010212
B18C	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	80	0.09185	0.009786
B18D	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	149	0.17107	0.012760
B18E	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	27	0.03100	0.005873
B18F	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	30	0.03444	0.006179
B18G	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	51	0.05855	0.007955
B18H	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	84	0.09644	0.010002
B18I	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	115	0.13203	0.011471
B19	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	7	0.00804	0.003025
B19A	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	317	23	0.07256	0.014570
C20A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	46	0.08259	0.011663
C20B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	90	0.16158	0.015595
C20C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	97	0.17415	0.016069
C20D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	97	0.17415	0.016069
C20E	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	101	0.18133	0.016325
C20F	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	69	0.12388	0.013959
C21	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	14	0.02513	0.006633
C22A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	35	0.10870	0.017346
C22B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	43	0.13354	0.018956
C22C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	43	0.13354	0.018956
C22D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	47	0.14596	0.019676
C23A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	36	0.11180	0.017561

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C23B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	30	0.09317	0.016198
C23C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	40	0.12422	0.018381
C24A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	46	0.14286	0.019501
C24B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	46	0.14286	0.019501
C25A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	40	0.12422	0.018381
C25B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	41	0.12733	0.018576
C26A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	34	0.10559	0.017126
C26B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	32	0.09938	0.016672
C26C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	34	0.10559	0.017126
C27	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	34	0.06104	0.010144
C27A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	279	78	0.27957	0.026868
C28A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	23	0.04129	0.008430
C28A1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	427	34	0.07963	0.013101
C28B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	26	0.04668	0.008938
C28B1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	339	31	0.09145	0.015655
C28C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	22	0.03950	0.008253
C28C1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	348	34	0.09770	0.015916
C28D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	27	0.04847	0.009100
C28D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	113	30	0.26549	0.041541
C28E	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	27	0.04847	0.009100
C28E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	171	33	0.19298	0.030179
C29A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29A1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	307	20	0.06515	0.014085
C29B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29B1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	553	46	0.08318	0.011743
C29C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29C1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	497	31	0.06237	0.010848
C29D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	18	0.03232	0.007493
C29D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	521	39	0.07486	0.011529
C29E	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	534	42	0.07865	0.011649
C29F	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29F1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	344	29	0.08430	0.014980
C29G	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29G1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	346	28	0.08092	0.014662
C29H	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29H1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	224	20	0.08929	0.019053
C29I	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	77	18	0.23377	0.048231
C29J	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.02873	0.007077
C29J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	94	19	0.20213	0.041421
C29K	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	17	0.03052	0.007289
C29K1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	378	23	0.06085	0.012295
C29L	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	17	0.03052	0.007289

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items, By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C29L1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	483	54	0.11180	0.014339
C29M	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	17	0.03052	0.007289
C29M1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	388	42	0.10825	0.015773
C29N	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	20	0.03591	0.007884
C29N1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	440	41	0.09318	0.013858
C29O	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	18	0.03232	0.007493
C29O1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	157	22	0.14013	0.027703
C30	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	557	32	0.05745	0.009860
C31	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	557	47	0.08438	0.011777
C32A	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C32A1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	172	34	0.19767	0.030366
C32B	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.09325	0.016489
C32B1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	272	41	0.15074	0.021694
C32C	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C32C1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	254	37	0.14567	0.022135
C32D	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C32D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	239	38	0.15900	0.023653
C32E	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	31	0.09968	0.016987
C32E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	247	42	0.17004	0.023903
C32F	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C32F1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	146	37	0.25342	0.035999
C32G	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C32G1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	149	39	0.26174	0.036012
C32H	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.09325	0.016489
C32H1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	144	31	0.21528	0.034251
C32I	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.09325	0.016489
C32I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	45	29	0.64444	0.071358
C32J	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.09325	0.016489
C32J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	67	30	0.44776	0.060750
C32K	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.09325	0.016489
C32K1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	228	33	0.14474	0.023301
C32L	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	32	0.10289	0.017228
C32L1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	220	47	0.21364	0.027634
C32M	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	33	0.10611	0.017464
C32M1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	196	46	0.23469	0.030272
C32N	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	32	0.10289	0.017228
C32N1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	159	41	0.25786	0.034693
C32O	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.09325	0.016489
C32O1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	80	31	0.38750	0.054468
C33	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	530	163	0.30755	0.020045
C33A	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	297	173	0.58249	0.028615
D34	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	16	0.01865	0.004618
D35A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	27	0.05625	0.010516
D35A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	293	32	0.10922	0.018222

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items,
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D35B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	32	0.06667	0.011386
D35B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	256	35	0.13672	0.021472
D35C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	25	0.05208	0.010142
D35C1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	321	38	0.11838	0.018031
D35D	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	29	0.06042	0.010875
D35D1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	78	31	0.39744	0.055410
D35E	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	27	0.05625	0.010516
D35E1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	138	30	0.21739	0.035112
D36	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	13	0.01515	0.004170
D37A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.04609	0.009387
D37A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	237	26	0.10970	0.020300
D37B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.04609	0.009387
D37B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	367	36	0.09809	0.015526
D37C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.04609	0.009387
D37C1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	292	30	0.10274	0.017768
D37D	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	25	0.05010	0.009766
D37D1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	272	37	0.13603	0.020787
D37E	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	24	0.04810	0.009579
D37E1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	278	36	0.12950	0.020137
D37F	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	22	0.04409	0.009190
D37F1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	168	26	0.15476	0.027904
D37G	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	21	0.04208	0.008988
D37G1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	153	27	0.17647	0.030820
D37H	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	24	0.04810	0.009579
D37H1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	198	28	0.14141	0.024763
D37I	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	22	0.04409	0.009190
D37I1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	51	22	0.43137	0.069351
D37J	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	20	0.04008	0.008781
D37J1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	84	22	0.26190	0.047972
D37K	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	22	0.04409	0.009190
D37K1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	346	27	0.07803	0.014420
D37L	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	27	0.05411	0.010127
D37L1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	250	43	0.17200	0.023868
D37M	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	28	0.05611	0.010302
D37M1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	224	44	0.19643	0.026545
D37N	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	27	0.05411	0.010127
D37N1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	212	41	0.19340	0.027126
D37O	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.04609	0.009387
D37O1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	91	28	0.30769	0.048382
D37P	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	44	0.08818	0.012693
D37P1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	80	45	0.56250	0.055463
D38	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	128	0.25651	0.019550
D39	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	20	0.04008	0.008781
D40A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	77	0.19845	0.020248

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates of 283 Items, By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D40A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	60	0.24490	0.027473
D40A2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	90	0.36735	0.030799
D40B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	71	0.18299	0.019630
D40B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	181	23	0.12707	0.024756
D40B2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	181	93	0.51381	0.037151
D40C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	108	0.27835	0.022753
D40C2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	174	93	0.53448	0.037815
D41	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	96	0.11189	0.010762
D42A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	62	0.07226	0.008839
D42B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	121	0.14103	0.011882
D42C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	121	0.14103	0.011882
D42D	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	170	0.19814	0.013608
D42E	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	73	0.08508	0.009525
D42F	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	95	0.11072	0.010713
D42G	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	116	0.13520	0.011673
D42H	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	142	0.16550	0.012687
D42I	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	160	0.18648	0.013297
D43	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	32	0.03730	0.006469
D43A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	213	45	0.21127	0.027970

Item Nonresponse Rates, Greater Than 20 Percent

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Items with Item Nonresponse Rates, Greater than .20
By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
AC5	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	177	0.20298	0.013621
B4A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	288	89	0.30903	0.027229
B16I1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	41	10	0.24390	0.067066
C27A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	279	78	0.27957	0.026868
C28D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	113	30	0.26549	0.041541
C29I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	77	18	0.23377	0.048231
C29J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	94	19	0.20213	0.041421
C32F1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	146	37	0.25342	0.035999
C32G1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	149	39	0.26174	0.036012
C32H1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	144	31	0.21528	0.034251
C32I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	45	29	0.64444	0.071358
C32J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	67	30	0.44776	0.060750
C32L1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	220	47	0.21364	0.027634
C32M1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	196	46	0.23469	0.030272
C32N1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	159	41	0.25786	0.034693
C32O1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	80	31	0.38750	0.054468
C33	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	530	163	0.30755	0.020045
C33A	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	297	173	0.58249	0.028615
D35D1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	78	31	0.39744	0.055410
D35E1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	138	30	0.21739	0.035112
D37I1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	51	22	0.43137	0.069351
D37J1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	84	22	0.26190	0.047972
D37O1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	91	28	0.30769	0.048382
D37P1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	80	45	0.56250	0.055463
D38	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	128	0.25651	0.019550
D40A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	60	0.24490	0.027473
D40A2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	90	0.36735	0.030799
D40B2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	181	93	0.51381	0.037151
D40C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	108	0.27835	0.022753
D40C2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	174	93	0.53448	0.037815
D43A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	213	45	0.21127	0.027970

Item Nonresponse Rates, Greater Than 10 Percent

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Items with Item Nonresponse Rates,
Greater than .10
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
AC5	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	177	0.20298	0.013621
AC6	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	172	0.19725	0.013475
B3	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	121	0.13892	0.011719
B4A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	288	89	0.30903	0.027229
B7C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	89	0.12259	0.012172
B8A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	86	0.11846	0.011993
B11A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	498	85	0.17068	0.016859
B12D1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	150	20	0.13333	0.027756
B13O1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	237	27	0.11392	0.020638
B16I1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	41	10	0.24390	0.067066
B16J1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	68	9	0.13235	0.041095
B16L1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	369	40	0.10840	0.016184
B16M1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	325	35	0.10769	0.017195
B16N1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	252	30	0.11905	0.020400
B16O1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	118	20	0.16949	0.034539
B18B	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	88	0.10103	0.010212
B18D	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	149	0.17107	0.012760
B18I	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	115	0.13203	0.011471
C20B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	90	0.16158	0.015595
C20C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	97	0.17415	0.016069
C20D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	97	0.17415	0.016069
C20E	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	101	0.18133	0.016325
C20F	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	69	0.12388	0.013959
C22A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	35	0.10870	0.017346
C22B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	43	0.13354	0.018956
C22C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	43	0.13354	0.018956
C22D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	47	0.14596	0.019676
C23A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	36	0.11180	0.017561
C23C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	40	0.12422	0.018381
C24A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	46	0.14286	0.019501
C24B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	46	0.14286	0.019501
C25A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	40	0.12422	0.018381
C25B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	41	0.12733	0.018576
C26A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	34	0.10559	0.017126
C26C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	34	0.10559	0.017126
C27A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	279	78	0.27957	0.026868
C28D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	113	30	0.26549	0.041541
C28E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	171	33	0.19298	0.030179
C29I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	77	18	0.23377	0.048231
C29J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	94	19	0.20213	0.041421
C29L1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	483	54	0.11180	0.014339
C29M1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	388	42	0.10825	0.015773
C29O1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	157	22	0.14013	0.027703

1. Institution Questionnaire: Items with Item Nonresponse Rates, Greater than .10 By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C32A1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	172	34	0.19767	0.030366
C32B1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	272	41	0.15074	0.021694
C32C1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	254	37	0.14567	0.022135
C32D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	239	38	0.15900	0.023653
C32E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	247	42	0.17004	0.023903
C32F1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	146	37	0.25342	0.035999
C32G1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	149	39	0.26174	0.036012
C32H1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	144	31	0.21528	0.034251
C32I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	45	29	0.64444	0.071358
C32J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	67	30	0.44776	0.060750
C32K1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	228	33	0.14474	0.023301
C32L	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	32	0.10289	0.017228
C32L1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	220	47	0.21364	0.027634
C32M	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	33	0.10611	0.017464
C32M1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	196	46	0.23469	0.030272
C32N	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	32	0.10289	0.017228
C32N1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	159	41	0.25786	0.034693
C32O1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	80	31	0.38750	0.054468
C33	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	530	163	0.30755	0.020045
C33A	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	297	173	0.58249	0.028615
D35A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	293	32	0.10922	0.018222
D35B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	256	35	0.13672	0.021472
D35C1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	321	38	0.11838	0.018031
D35D1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	78	31	0.39744	0.055410
D35E1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	138	30	0.21739	0.035112
D37A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	237	26	0.10970	0.020300
D37C1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	292	30	0.10274	0.017768
D37D1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	272	37	0.13603	0.020787
D37E1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	278	36	0.12950	0.020137
D37F1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	168	26	0.15476	0.027904
D37G1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	153	27	0.17647	0.030820
D37H1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	198	28	0.14141	0.024763
D37I1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	51	22	0.43137	0.069351
D37J1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	84	22	0.26190	0.047972
D37L1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	250	43	0.17200	0.023868
D37M1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	224	44	0.19643	0.026545
D37N1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	212	41	0.19340	0.027126
D37O1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	91	28	0.30769	0.048382
D37P1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	80	45	0.56250	0.055463
D38	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	128	0.25651	0.019550
D40A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	77	0.19845	0.020248
D40A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	60	0.24490	0.027473
D40A2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	90	0.36735	0.030799

1. Institution Questionnaire: Items with Item Nonresponse Rates, Greater than .10 By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D40B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	71	0.18299	0.019630
D40B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	181	23	0.12707	0.024756
D40B2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	181	93	0.51381	0.037151
D40C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	108	0.27835	0.022753
D40C2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	174	93	0.53448	0.037815
D41	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	96	0.11189	0.010762
D42B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	121	0.14103	0.011882
D42C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	121	0.14103	0.011882
D42D	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	170	0.19814	0.013608
D42F	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	95	0.11072	0.010713
D42G	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	116	0.13520	0.011673
D42H	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	142	0.16550	0.012687
D42I	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	160	0.18648	0.013297
D43A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	213	45	0.21127	0.027970

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by Rate

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
A1A	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	0	0.000000	0.000000
B2A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	0	0.000000	0.000000
B5	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	0	0.000000	0.000000
B13A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.005741	0.002560
B13D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.005741	0.002560
B13E	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.005741	0.002560
B13G	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.005741	0.002560
B13H	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.005741	0.002560
B13J	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	5	0.005741	0.002560
B13B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.006889	0.002803
B13C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.006889	0.002803
B13F	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.006889	0.002803
B13I	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.006889	0.002803
B13M	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.006889	0.002803
B13O	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	6	0.006889	0.002803
B13K	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	7	0.008037	0.003025
B13L	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	7	0.008037	0.003025
B13N	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	7	0.008037	0.003025
B19	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	7	0.008037	0.003025
A1B	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	10	0.011468	0.003606
B12A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	10	0.011481	0.003610
B16J	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	7	0.012195	0.004581
B16K	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	7	0.012195	0.004581
B16O	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	7	0.012195	0.004581
B12E	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	12	0.013777	0.003950
B16B	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.013937	0.004893
B16F	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.013937	0.004893
B16G	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.013937	0.004893
B16H	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.013937	0.004893
B16I	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	8	0.013937	0.004893
A1C	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	13	0.014908	0.004104
B12C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	13	0.014925	0.004109
B12D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	13	0.014925	0.004109
D36	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	13	0.015152	0.004170
B16A	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	9	0.015679	0.005185
B12B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	14	0.016073	0.004261
B16C	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	10	0.017422	0.005461
B11	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	16	0.018370	0.004550
D34	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	16	0.018648	0.004618
B16D	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	12	0.020906	0.005972
B16E	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	12	0.020906	0.005972
B6A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	16	0.022039	0.005449
B13H1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	342	8	0.023392	0.008173
B18A	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	21	0.024110	0.005197

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N.= number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B10B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	18	0.024793	0.005771
C21	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	14	0.025135	0.006633
B16L	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	15	0.026132	0.006659
B10A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	19	0.026171	0.005925
B16M	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	16	0.027875	0.006871
B16N	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	574	16	0.027875	0.006871
B13K1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	568	16	0.028169	0.006942
B13A1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	460	13	0.028261	0.007727
C29A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29E	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29F	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29G	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29H	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29I	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
C29J	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	16	0.028725	0.007077
A1D	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	26	0.029817	0.005760
B15	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	26	0.029851	0.005766
B10C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	22	0.030303	0.006362
C29K	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	17	0.030521	0.007289
C29L	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	17	0.030521	0.007289
C29M	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	17	0.030521	0.007289
B18E	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	27	0.030999	0.005873
C29D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	18	0.032316	0.007493
C29O	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	18	0.032316	0.007493
B2F	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	29	0.033295	0.006079
B18F	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	30	0.034443	0.006179
B12B1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	493	17	0.034483	0.008218
B16A1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	308	11	0.035714	0.010574
C29N	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	20	0.035907	0.007884
D43	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	32	0.037296	0.006469
B16H1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	236	9	0.038136	0.012467
B12A1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	654	25	0.038226	0.007498
B6B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	28	0.038567	0.007147
B13C1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	775	30	0.038710	0.006929
C28C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	22	0.039497	0.008253
D37J	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	20	0.040080	0.008781
D39	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	20	0.040080	0.008781
C28A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	23	0.041293	0.008430
B14	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	36	0.041332	0.006745
D37G	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	21	0.042084	0.008988
B6C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	32	0.044077	0.007618
D37F	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	22	0.044088	0.009190

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N - number of eligible unit respondents
NR - number of item nonresponses
RATE [illegible]R/N - item nonresponse rate
STDERR - standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
D37I	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	22	0.044088	0.009190
D37K	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	22	0.044088	0.009190
B13G1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	538	24	0.044610	0.008900
B13F1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	523	24	0.045889	0.009150
D37A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.046092	0.009387
D37B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.046092	0.009387
D37C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.046092	0.009387
D37O	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	23	0.046092	0.009387
C28B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	26	0.046679	0.008938
B13D1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	807	38	0.047088	0.007457
D37E	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	24	0.048096	0.009579
D37H	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	24	0.048096	0.009579
B9A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	35	0.048209	0.007950
C28D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	27	0.048474	0.009100
C28E	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	27	0.048474	0.009100
B16K1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	391	19	0.048593	0.010874
D37D	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	25	0.050100	0.009766
B13B1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	866	44	0.050808	0.007463
B9B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	37	0.050964	0.008162
D35C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	25	0.052083	0.010142
B16C1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	436	23	0.052752	0.010706
B2B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	46	0.052813	0.007578
AC4	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	47	0.053899	0.007647
D37L	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	27	0.054108	0.010127
D37N	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	27	0.054108	0.010127
B16B1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	504	28	0.055556	0.010203
D37M	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	28	0.056112	0.010302
D35A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	27	0.056250	0.010516
D35E	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	27	0.056250	0.010516
B4	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	50	0.057405	0.007882
C30	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	557	32	0.057451	0.009860
B7B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	42	0.057851	0.008665
B2C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	51	0.058553	0.007955
B2D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	51	0.058553	0.007955
B18G	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	51	0.058553	0.007955
B13E1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	834	49	0.058753	0.008143
D35D	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	29	0.060417	0.010875
AC2	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	53	0.060780	0.008091
C29K1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	378	23	0.060847	0.012295
C27	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	34	0.061041	0.010144
B6D	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	45	0.061983	0.008949
C29C1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	497	31	0.062374	0.010848
B12C1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	534	34	0.063670	0.010566
C29A1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	307	20	0.065147	0.014085

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire

N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
B16D1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	413	27	0.065375	0.012163
D35B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	480	32	0.066667	0.011386
B13J1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	119	8	0.067227	0.022955
B13N1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	698	47	0.067335	0.009485
D42A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	62	0.072261	0.008839
B19A	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	317	23	0.072555	0.014570
B13M1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	614	45	0.073290	0.010517
B2E	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	64	0.073479	0.008841
B12E1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	258	19	0.073643	0.016261
AC1	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	65	0.074541	0.008894
C29D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	521	39	0.074856	0.011529
B7A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	56	0.077135	0.009902
B16G1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	232	18	0.077586	0.017564
B13L1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	771	60	0.077821	0.009648
D37K1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	346	27	0.078035	0.014420
C29E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	534	42	0.078652	0.011649
B16E1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	430	34	0.079070	0.013013
C28A1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	427	34	0.079625	0.013101
B16F1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	238	19	0.079832	0.017568
C29G1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	346	28	0.080925	0.014662
C20A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	46	0.082585	0.011663
B8B	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	60	0.082645	0.010219
C29B1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	553	46	0.083183	0.011743
C29F1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	344	29	0.084302	0.014980
C31	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	557	47	0.084381	0.011777
D42E	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	73	0.085082	0.009525
D37P	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	44	0.088176	0.012693
B13I1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	102	9	0.088235	0.028084
B17	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	77	0.088404	0.009619
C29H1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	224	20	0.089286	0.019053
C28B1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	339	31	0.091445	0.015655
B18C	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	80	0.091848	0.009786
C23B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	30	0.093168	0.016198
C29N1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	440	41	0.093182	0.013858
C32B	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.093248	0.016489
C32H	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.093248	0.016489
C32I	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.093248	0.016489
C32J	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.093248	0.016489
C32K	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.093248	0.016489
C32O	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	29	0.093248	0.016489
AC3	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	82	0.094037	0.009884
B18H	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	84	0.096441	0.010002
C32A	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.096463	0.016741
C32C	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.096463	0.016741

1. Institution Questionnaire:
Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C32D	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C32F	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C32G	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	30	0.09646	0.016741
C28C1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	348	34	0.09770	0.015916
D37B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	367	36	0.09809	0.015526
C26B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	32	0.09938	0.016672
C32E	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	31	0.09968	0.016987
B18B	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	88	0.10103	0.010212
D37C1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	292	30	0.10274	0.017768
C32L	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	32	0.10289	0.017228
C32N	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	32	0.10289	0.017228
C26A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	34	0.10559	0.017126
C26C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	34	0.10559	0.017126
C32M	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	311	33	0.10611	0.017464
B16M1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	325	35	0.10769	0.017195
C29M1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	388	42	0.10825	0.015773
B16L1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	369	40	0.10840	0.016184
C22A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	35	0.10870	0.017346
D35A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	293	32	0.10922	0.018222
D37A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	237	26	0.10970	0.020300
D42F	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	95	0.11072	0.010713
C23A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	36	0.11180	0.017561
C29L1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	483	54	0.11180	0.014339
D41	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	96	0.11189	0.010762
B13O1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	237	27	0.11392	0.020638
D35C1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	321	38	0.11838	0.018031
B8A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	86	0.11846	0.011993
B16N1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	252	30	0.11905	0.020400
B7C	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	726	89	0.12259	0.012172
C20F	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	69	0.12388	0.013959
C23C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	40	0.12422	0.018381
C25A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	40	0.12422	0.018381
D40B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	181	23	0.12707	0.024756
C25B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	41	0.12733	0.018576
D37E1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	278	36	0.12950	0.020137
B18I	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	115	0.13203	0.011471
B16J1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	68	9	0.13235	0.041095
B12D1	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	150	20	0.13333	0.027756
C22B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	43	0.13354	0.018956
C22C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	43	0.13354	0.018956
D42G	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	116	0.13520	0.011673
D37D1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	272	37	0.13603	0.020787
D35B1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	256	35	0.13672	0.021472
B3	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	871	121	0.13892	0.011719

1. Institution Questionnaire:

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C29O1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	157	22	0.14013	0.027703
D42B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	121	0.14103	0.011882
D42C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	121	0.14103	0.011882
D37H1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	198	28	0.14141	0.024763
C24A	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	46	0.14286	0.019501
C24B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	46	0.14286	0.019501
C32K1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	228	33	0.14474	0.023301
C32C1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	254	37	0.14567	0.022135
C22D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	322	47	0.14596	0.019676
C32B1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	272	41	0.15074	0.021694
D37F1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	168	26	0.15476	0.027904
C32D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	239	38	0.15900	0.023653
C20B	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	90	0.16158	0.015595
D42H	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	142	0.16550	0.012687
B16O1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	118	20	0.16949	0.034539
C32E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	247	42	0.17004	0.023903
B11A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	498	85	0.17068	0.016859
B18D	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	871	149	0.17107	0.012760
D37L1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	250	43	0.17200	0.023868
C20C	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	97	0.17415	0.016069
C20D	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	97	0.17415	0.016069
D37G1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	153	27	0.17647	0.030820
C20E	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	557	101	0.18133	0.016325
D40B	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	71	0.18299	0.019630
D42I	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	160	0.18648	0.013297
C28E1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	171	33	0.19298	0.030179
D37N1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	212	41	0.19340	0.027126
D37M1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	224	44	0.19643	0.026545
AC6	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	172	0.19725	0.013475
C32A1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	172	34	0.19767	0.030366
D42D	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	858	170	0.19814	0.013608
D40A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	77	0.19845	0.020248
C29J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	94	19	0.20213	0.041421
AC5	A. Preface	1. Pre - Q14	872	177	0.20298	0.013621
D43A	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	213	45	0.21127	0.027970
C32L1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	220	47	0.21364	0.027634
C32H1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	144	31	0.21528	0.034251
D35E1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	138	30	0.21739	0.035112
C29I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	77	18	0.23377	0.048231
C32M1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	196	46	0.23469	0.030272
B16I1	B. FT Instructional	2. Q15 - Q29	41	10	0.24390	0.067066
D40A1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	60	0.24490	0.027473
C32F1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	146	37	0.25342	0.035999
D38	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	499	128	0.25651	0.019550

1. Institution Questionnaire:

Item Nonresponse Rates, Sorted by RATE
By Section and Third of Questionnaire
N = number of eligible unit respondents
NR = number of item nonresponses
RATE = NR/N = item nonresponse rate
STDERR = standard error of rate

ITEM	SECTION	THIRD	N	NR	RATE	STDERR
C32N1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	159	41	0.25786	0.034693
C32G1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	149	39	0.26174	0.036012
D37J1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	84	22	0.26190	0.047972
C28D1	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	113	30	0.26549	0.041541
D40C	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	388	108	0.27835	0.022753
C27A .	C. FT Non-instruct.	2. Q15 - Q29	279	78	0.27957	0.026868
C33	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	530	163	0.30755	0.020045
D37O1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	91	28	0.30769	0.048382
B4A	B. FT Instructional	1. Pre - Q14	288	89	0.30903	0.027229
D40A2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	245	90	0.36735	0.030799
C32O1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	80	31	0.38750	0.054468
D35D1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	78	31	0.39744	0.055410
D37I1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	51	22	0.43137	0.069351
C32J1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	67	30	0.44776	0.060750
D40B2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	181	93	0.51381	0.037151
D40C2	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	174	93	0.53448	0.037815
D37P1	D. PT instructional	3. Q30 - Q43	80	45	0.56250	0.055463
C33A	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	297	173	0.58249	0.028615
C32I1	C. FT Non-instruct.	3. Q30 - Q43	45	29	0.64444	0.071358

Appendix K

Letters and Forms for Institution Recruitment

Letter to Chief Administrative Officer

Letter to Institutional Official

Confirmation Form

Faculty List Documentation Form
Checklist (reverse side of Faculty List Documentation Form)

Instructions for Preparing Lists of Faculty

Instructions for Preparing Machine-Readable Lists of Faculty

Affidavit of Nondisclosure

1993 NSOPF Brochure

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

NSOPF-93
Endorsed by:

American Association for Higher Education

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

American Association of University Professors

American Federation of Teachers

Association for Institutional Research

Association of American Colleges

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities

College and University Personnel Association

The College Board

Council of Graduate Schools

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities

National Education Association

The United Negro College Fund, Inc.

October 5, 1992

Dear Chief Administrative Officer:

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is conducting the second cycle of the **National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)** with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation. This will be the most comprehensive study of higher education faculty ever undertaken. Your institution has been selected--as part of a national probability sample of higher education institutions and faculty--for inclusion in NSOPF-93, and I am asking for your participation in this important research.

Higher education faculty have a major influence on our nation's youth and they perform much of the research and development upon which the nation's technological advancement depends. Thus, it is essential to understand who they are; what they do; and whether, how, and why they are changing. NSOPF-93 will provide a profile of faculty in two- and four-year higher education institutions, and will gather information on the backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes of both full- and part-time, instructional and non-instructional faculty. NCES has contracted with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to carry out the study.

As a participating institution, you are requested to:

- Designate an individual to act as your institution's coordinator. This person will act as a liaison with NORC staff, and will also provide NORC with the list of faculty at your institution, which will serve as a sampling frame from which individual faculty members will be randomly selected. The enclosed materials from NORC include instructions for the Institutional Coordinator and should make compiling the list a relatively quick and easy task. Please forward the NORC folder, including the list preparation instructions and forms, to your designated Institutional Coordinator as soon as possible.

- Name an Institutional Respondent--an academic official, such as a provost or dean of academic affairs--who can best respond to questions about your institution's characteristics, policies, and practices. A questionnaire will be sent to this individual at a later date.

- Complete the enclosed Confirmation Form, with the names and campus addresses and telephone numbers of the person(s) you have designated as the Institutional Coordinator and Respondent, and return it to NORC within five days.

-over-

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

Data provided by your institution and by sampled faculty will be held in strictest confidence. Individual responses, and all information that would permit the identification of individuals or institutions, will be protected by the Family Educational Rights Privacy Act of 1976, and by Section 406(d) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Education amendments of 1988, Public Law 100-297. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries, and individual responses will not be disclosed to any person or group, either within the sample institution or outside it.

While your participation is voluntary, it is critical if we are to obtain nationally representative samples of higher education institutions and their faculty. Data collection procedures and questionnaires have been developed to minimize burden on institution staff.

If you have questions or comments concerning the study or this request, please contact the Project Director, Dr. Sameer Abraham of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC or the NCES Project Officer, Linda Zimbler, at (202) 219-1834.

I appreciate your interest in this important and useful study, and I thank you for your participation. When the project is completed, NCES will send you a copy of the final analytic report.

Sincerely,

Emerson J. Elliott
Commissioner

Enclosures

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

NSOPF-93
Endorsed by:

American Association for Higher Education

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

American Association of University Professors

American Federation of Teachers

Association for Institutional Research

Association of American Colleges

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities

College and University Personnel Association

The College Board

Council of Graduate Schools

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities

National Education Association

The United Negro College Fund, Inc.

October 5, 1992

Dear Institutional Official:

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is conducting the second cycle of the **National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)** with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation. This will be the most comprehensive study of higher education faculty ever undertaken. Your institution has been selected—as part of a national probability sample of higher education institutions and faculty—for inclusion in NSOPF-93.

Higher education faculty have a major influence on our nation's youth and they perform much of the research and development upon which the nation's technological advancement depends. Thus, it is essential to understand who they are; what they do; and whether, how, and why they are changing. NSOPF-93 will provide a profile of faculty in two- and four-year higher education institutions, and will gather information on the backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes of both full- and part-time, instructional and non-instructional faculty. NCES has contracted with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to carry out the study.

You have been designated by your institution's Chief Administrative Officer as the Coordinator for NSOPF-93. As the institutional coordinator, I would appreciate your assistance in preparing a list of faculty who were employed by your institution during the fall 1992 academic term.

This NORC folder contains instructions for preparing lists of faculty. The lists will serve as a sampling frame from which individual faculty members at your institution will be randomly selected. Your faculty list should be accompanied by a completed Faculty List Documentation Form, and any other documentation necessary to interpret the list. We ask that you provide the list in both hard copy and machine-readable versions; NORC has provided instructions for preparing the list and electronic files. NORC will need to receive the list of faculty **no later than October 30, 1992**. I am also asking that you include in your mailing a fall 1992 directory of faculty.

Data provided by your institution and by sampled faculty will be held in strictest confidence. Individual responses, and all information that would permit the identification of individuals or institutions, will be protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1976 and Section 406(d) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Education amendments of 1988, Public Law 100-297. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries, and individual responses will not be disclosed to any person or group, either within your institution or outside it.

-over-

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

To conform with these confidentiality protections, please sign and notarize the enclosed NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure. In signing this Affidavit, you are pledging that any information you may obtain regarding faculty in the NSOPF sample will not be released by you to anyone at your institution or elsewhere.

I understand that your institution may have provisions against releasing certain types of information; please contact NORC at the toll-free number below if your institution has such provisions concerning any of the information requested. Once NORC has mailed questionnaires to the faculty sample members from your institution, you may be asked for your assistance in prompting these individuals to complete the survey by the scheduled due date.

Public reporting burden for this information is estimated to average one hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, identifying data sources, gathering the data, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1850-0665, Washington, D.C. 20503.

If you have questions or comments concerning the study or about preparing the lists, please contact the Project Director, Dr. Sameer Abraham of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, toll-free, at 1-800-733-NORC.

I appreciate your interest in this important and useful study, and I thank you again for your participation. When the project is completed, NCES will send your institution a copy of the final analytic report.

Sincerely,

Emerson J. Elliott
Commissioner

Enclosures

OMB #1850-0665
Expiration: 12/93

NORC 4552
September 1992

[TO BE COMPLETED BY THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER]

Confirmation Form

1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

Correct label information:
(Write in any address corrections on or alongside the label)

Please type or print

Name of Chief Administrative Officer______________________________________
(if different from above) Last First

Name of Institution______________________________________

Institutional Coordinator. Institutional official who will prepare the lists of faculty for the 1992-1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (see "Instructions for Preparing Lists of Faculty") and act as a liaison to the study.

Name______________________________________
Last First

Institutional Title______________________________________

Mailing Address______________________________________

____

Campus Telephone (____)______________________________________

Institutional Respondent. Institutional official who has been designated to receive the questionnaire on institutional characteristics, policies, and practices. (The Institutional Respondent may be the same person who acts as the Institutional Coordinator.)

Name______________________________________
Last First

Institutional Title______________________________________

Mailing Address______________________________________

____

Campus Telephone (____)______________________________________

Please return the white and yellow copies of this form to the government contractor within 5 days. You may fax the form, or return it in the pre-paid envelope provided.

Fax form to:

Dr. Sameer Y. Abraham
NORC, University of Chicago
NSOPF-93 (4552)
(312) 753-7886

Mail form to:

Dr. Sameer Y. Abraham
Project Director, NSOPF-93 (4552)
NORC, University of Chicago
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Thank you again for your cooperation

Distribution: White = NORC Yellow = NORC Pink = Institution Copy

OMB #1850-0665
Expiration: 12/93

NORC 4552
September 1992

[TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATOR]

Faculty List Documentation Form

1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

Correct label information:
(Write in any address
corrections on or alongside
the label)

Please complete both sides of this form and return it along with the complete faculty lists.

1. **Institutional coordinator information:**

Institutional Coordinator ______________________________
Last name First name

Name of Institution ______________________________

Institutional Title ______________________________

2. **How many individuals and/or offices provided information for the faculty lists?** ______

3. **For each separate individual and/or office (e.g., payroll, personnel, etc.) providing data, list below the name, title, and telephone number of a person we can contact should we have any questions concerning the lists.**

Contact Person				Name of Office (e.g., personnel, payroll, etc.)	Data Provided (e.g., department discipline, etc.)
Last Name	First Name	Title	Telephone		
1.			( )		
2.			( )		
3.			( )		
4.			( )		
5.			( )		
6.			( )		

4. **Please indicate the format of the faculty lists.**

☐ Hard copy ☛ *How many different hard copy lists are being submitted?* ______

☐ Floppy disk ☛ *Please complete the* Instructions for Preparing Machine-Readable Lists of Faculty *form.*

☐ Computer tape ☛ *Please complete the* Instructions for Preparing Machine-Readable Lists of Faculty *form.*

☐ Other ☛ *Please explain:* ______________________________

____

PLEASE COMPLETE THE REVERSE PAGE

OMB #.550-0665
Expiration: 12.93

[TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATOR]

NORC 4552
September 1992

Checklist

1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

Please complete the checklist below and return it with the faculty lists and supplementary materials. If you have any questions about any of the items listed, please call Dr. Sameer Y. Abraham, toll-free, at 1-(800) 711-NORC.

THE PACKET YOU RETURN TO US SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

☐ Complete lists of faculty and instructional non-faculty (hard copy and machine-readable versions)
☐ Completed Faculty List Documentation Form (on the reverse side of this checklist)
☐ Directory of faculty and staff
☐ Notarized affidavit signed by the institutional coordinator

TO BE COMPLETE THE FACULTY LIST SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES OF PERSONNEL

☐ Full-time instructional personnel with faculty status
☐ Part-time instructional personnel with faculty status
☐ Temporary instructional personnel with faculty status
☐ Permanent and temporary personnel who have instructional duties but no faculty status
☐ Full-time *non*-instructional personnel with faculty status
☐ Part-time *non*-instructional personnel with faculty status
☐ Temporary *non*-instructional personnel with faculty status
☐ Faculty and other instructional personnel on sabbatical leave

FOR EACH PERSON LISTED, THE FOLLOWING DATA IS REQUESTED

☐ Campus addresses and telephone numbers (indicate main mailing address)
☐ Home addresses and telephone numbers (indicate mailing address)
☐ Department/program affiliation (e.g., English, Engineering, Education)
☐ Academic field or teaching discipline (e.g., American Literature, Chemical Engineering, Botany)
☐ Race/ethnicity
☐ Gender
☐ Full-time or part-time status
☐ Employee ID number

5. Is there any additional information (e.g., faculty designations, abbreviations, codes, etc.) which would assist us in reading the lists? Please explain, and include any necessary documentation with the lists.

____

____

____

____

Return this form and other documentation to:

Dr. Sameer Y. Abraham
Project Director, NSOPF-93 (4552)
NORC, University of Chicago
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OMB #1850-0665
Expiration: 12/93

NORC 4552
September 1992

Instructions for Preparing Lists of Faculty

Fall 1992 Academic Term
1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

The list of faculty that you provide will be used in randomly selecting a national sample to represent all faculty in higher education institutions in the country. To ensure a scientifically accurate sample, it is extremely important that you follow the instructions below in preparing your institution's list. Because postsecondary education institutions vary widely in their organizational structures and staffing patterns, we realize that some of the criteria presented below may not apply to your institution. Also, different institutions use different definitions of "faculty" and "non-faculty" positions, "temporary" and "permanent" status, and "full-time" and "part-time" status. In reading the instructions, please interpret these terms according to *your institution's usage*. Should you have any questions about the classification of personnel, or whether they should or should not be included in the lists, we urge you to contact us at 1-(800) 733-6672.

1. The fall 1992 academic term is that term which includes the date **October 15, 1992**.

2. **INCLUDE** the following categories personnel on your faculty list:

   - those full- and part-time personnel whose regular assignment includes instruction
   - those full- and part-time faculty whose regular assignment includes only research
   - permanent and temporary faculty, including those who have adjunct, acting, or visiting status
   - permanent and temporary personnel who have any instructional duties, including those who have adjunct, acting, or visiting status
   - faculty and instructional personnel on sabbatical leave
   - administrators and all other personnel who have faculty status.

   BUT DO NOT INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS:

   - faculty and other personnel with instructional duties outside the U.S. (but not on sabbatical leave)
   - temporary replacements for instructional and non-instructional personnel
   - faculty and other instructional and non-instructional personnel on leave without pay
   - teaching and research assistants
   - military personnel who teach only ROTC courses
   - instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors

-OVER-

3. For each person listed, please provide the following information:

   a. **Full name**
   b. **Campus address and telephone number**
   c. **Home address and telephone number**
   d. **Department/program affiliation (e.g., English, Engineering, Education)**
   e. **Academic or teaching discipline (e.g., American Literature, Chemical Engineering, Botany)**
   f. **Race/ethnicity:**
      - **White (not of Hispanic origin)**
      - **Black (not of Hispanic origin)**
      - **Hispanic**
      - **Asian or Pacific Islander**
      - **American Indian or Alaskan Native**
   g. **Gender**
   h. **Full- or part-time status**
   i. **Employee ID number**

4. If this information is not available on a single master list, please submit all applicable lists. Indicate how many lists are being submitted in item [4] of the Faculty List Documentation Form.

5. Please submit the lists in machine-readable (i.e., diskette or computer tape) **and** hard copy formats. The "Instructions for Preparing Machine-Readable Lists of Faculty" provide guidelines for formatting machine-readable files.

6. We need to receive your lists within three weeks (or sooner, if possible).

7. Please also include a copy of your fall 1992 directory of faculty and staff.

If you have any questions about preparing the lists, please call us toll free at 1-(800) 733-6672.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

OMB #1850-0665
Expiration: 12/93

[TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATOR]

NORC 4552
September 1992

Instructions for Preparing Machine-Readable Lists of Faculty

1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93)

Please follow the guidelines below when preparing machine-readable lists of faculty. We realize that computer capabilities vary widely across institutions and that some of these guidelines cannot be met; be sure to provide documentation to describe any special circumstances or deviations from these guidelines. Please also enclose a hard copy of the list along with your electronic file or computer tape.

FOR ALL MACHINE-READABLE FACULTY LISTS USE THE FOLLOWING FILE LAYOUT. THE FILE WILL BE READ BASED ON COLUMNS SPECIFIED BY THE NUMBER OF CHARACTERS. DO NOT USE SPECIAL CHARACTERS OR DELIMITERS. FILL ANY BLANK FIELDS WITH THE SYMBOL "$".

Starting Column No.	No. of Characters	Field
1	25	First name
26	25	Last name
51	1	Middle initial
52	35	Campus address line 1
87	35	Campus address line 2
122	20	Campus city
142	2	Campus state
144	9	Campus zipcode
153	14	Campus telephone number
167	35	Home address line 1
202	35	Home address line 2
237	20	Home city
257	2	Home state
259	9	Home zipcode
268	10	Home telephone number
278	9	Employee ID number
287	20	Academic field or teaching discipline
307	20	Departmental/program affiliation
327	1	Race/ethnicity code 1-5, as follows: 1= White (not of Hispanic origin) 2= Black (not of Hispanic origin) 3= Hispanic 4= Asian or Pacific Islander 5= American Indian or Alaskan Native
328	1	Gender (1=male, 2=female)
329	1	Full-time or part-time status (1=full, 2=part)

FLOPPY DISKS SHOULD BE PROVIDED IN ASCII FORMAT
FLOPPY DISKS SHOULD BE FORMATTED FOR MS-DOS 3.0 (OR LATER VERSION)

FOR EACH FACULTY LIST ON COMPUTER TAPE, PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

a. Tape label (external, VOL=SER)____________________________

b. Density (BPI): ____6250 ____1600

c. Recording mode: ____EBCDIC ____ASCII

d. Internal labeling: ____none ___labelled

e. Logical record length ____ Number of records _______________

f. Record format (FB, for fixed block, for example) _______________

g. Sequential tape label on which file is located_________________

h. Data set name (DSN, if any)__________________________________

FACULTY LISTS ON COMPUTER TAPE SHOULD BE PROVIDED ON 9 TRACK TAPE

Return this form along with the machine-readable file, hard copy lists, and other documentation to:

Dr. Sameer Y. Abraham
Project Director, NSOPF-93 (4552)
NORC, University of Chicago
1525 East 55th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

OMB #1850-0665
Expiration: 12/93

AFFIDAVIT OF NONDISCLOSURE

> *To be completed by the Institutional Coordinator:* The National Center for Education Statistics requires that anyone who may have access to data or to the identities of individual sample members complete this form.

(Please type or print)

______________________	______________________
(Title of Institutional Coordinator)	(Date)
______________________	1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty
(Name of Institution)	(NCES study)

I, ______________________, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that when given access to the subject NCES data base or other information about individual sample members, I will not:

(i) use or reveal any individually assembled identifiable data furnished, acquired, retrieved or assembled by me or others, under the provisions of Section 406 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1), for any purpose other than statistical purposes specified in the NCES survey, project, or contract;

(ii) make any disclosure or publication whereby a sample unit or survey respondent could be identified or the data furnished by or related to any particular person under this section can be identified;

or

(iii) permit anyone other than the individuals authorized by the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics to examine the individual reports.

____
(Signature)

The penalty for unlawful disclosure is a fine of not more than $250,000 (under 18 U.S.C. 3559 and 3571) or imprisonment for not more than five years, or both. The word "swear" should be stricken out wherever it appears when a person elects to affirm the affidavit rather than to swear to it.

State of __________

County of __________

Signed and sworn (or affirmed) before me on ______________ (date) by ______________________ (name of person making statement)

____
(signature of notary public)

Commision expires on ______________

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

ENDORSEMENTS

The following organizations have formally endorsed NSOPF-93, recognizing the study's contribution to the advancement of higher education:

American Association for Higher Education
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
American Association of University Professors
American Federation of Teachers
Association for Institutional Research
Association of American Colleges
Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities
College and University Personnel Association
The College Board
Council of Graduate Schools
National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education
National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities
National Education Association
The United Negro College Fund, Inc.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Please contact:

Project Director
Dr. Sameer Abraham (1-800-733-6672)

Associate Project Director
Natalie Suter (1-800-733-6672)

If you have additional questions, please call the NCES Project Officer, Linda Zimbler at (202) 219-1834.

1993

NATIONAL

STUDY

OF

POSTSECONDARY

FACULTY

Sponsored by the
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education

with support from the
National Endowment for the Humanities
National Science Foundation

Conducted by the
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY?

Faculties are the pivotal resource around which postsecondary education revolves. They determine curriculum content, student performance standards, and the quality of students' preparation for careers. Faculty members perform research and development work upon which this nation's technological and economic advancement depend. Through their public service activities, they also contribute to the public good. For these reasons, it is essential to understand who they are; what they do; and whether, how, and why they are changing.

The 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) is being conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation, to respond to the continuing need for data on higher education faculty and instructors--those who directly affect the quality of education in postsecondary institutions.

The 1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-88) generated immediate interest in the higher education community because there had previously been very little comprehensive information available on this key national resource. This second cycle will expand the information base about faculty in several ways. It will allow for comparisons to be made over time. It will allow for more detailed comparisons among faculty in various disciplines, because of an increase in the sample size. It will examine critical issues surrounding faculty that have developed since the 1988 study, and it will describe research faculty as well as instructional faculty in higher education institutions.

The study is designed to address a variety of policy-relevant issues for both faculty and institutions, including:

- What are the background characteristics of full- and part-time faculty?
- What are the workloads of faculty and how is their time allocated between classroom instruction and other activities?
- What are the compensation and fringe benefit packages provided to faculty? How important are other sources of income or income-in-kind?
- What are the faculty's attitudes and perceptions about their professional status, student preparation for college-level work, student achievement, and other issues?
- What are the career and retirement plans of faculty?
- How many full- and part-time faculty are there?
- What are their distributions by rank and tenure?
- Have institutions changed their policies on granting faculty tenure? Are changes anticipated in the future?
- What effect does policy on tenure and retirement have on career paths?
- What benefits and retirement plans are available to faculty?

HOW NSOPF-93 WILL BE CONDUCTED

The National Center for Education Statistics has contracted with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to collect the data for this study.

NSOPF-93 includes both a pilot test and a full-scale study. The pilot test of 136 institutions and 640 faculty was conducted in the winter and spring of 1992 to refine the data collection procedures and questionnaires. The full-scale study of a nationally representative sample of approximately 800 institutions and more than 32,000 faculty will be conducted in the fall of 1992 and the winter and spring of 1993.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISSEMINATION

Data collected from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty are made available to the public in various ways:

- Descriptive reports are published through NCES on selected topics. For example, the following reports were published based on NSOPF-88 data: *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education; A Descriptive Report of Academic Departments in Higher Education Institutions; Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988;* and *Profiles of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988;*
- Special tabulations are provided to the public;
- Data files (without identifying information) are released to organizations who have agreed in writing to abide by the confidentiality requirements of the study; and
- Study findings are presented at conferences.

FINDINGS FROM NSOPF-88

The following are examples of the information obtained from NSOPF-88:

- The mean age of full-time faculty at higher education institutions in 1987-88 was 47 years, and that of part-time faculty was 44 years.
- Across all institutions of higher education, whites accounted for 89 percent of full-time faculty and 90 percent of part-time faculty. Asian Americans constituted 4 percent of the full-time faculty, blacks 3 percent, Hispanics 2 percent, and American Indians 1 percent. Minorities accounted for similar proportions of part-time faculty.
- Men made up 73 percent of full-time faculty and 56 percent of part-time faculty. Among full-time faculty, research universities had a significantly higher percentage of men (80 percent), whereas public two-year institutions had a significantly lower percentage (62 percent).
- Sixty percent of full-time faculty were tenured, and another 22 percent were on tenure track.
- The average base salary for full-time faculty during the 1987 calendar year was $39,439. The average total

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

income—base salary, other institutional income, consulting, and other outside income—was $48,701. For part-time faculty, the average base salary was $6,829, and the average total income was $33,841, including income from other (perhaps full-time) employment.

- Forty-two percent of the full-time faculty earned some income from consulting and averaged $7,886 per year in consulting income. Twenty-eight percent of the full-time faculty had other kinds of income averaging $8,412 from these sources.
- Among full-time faculty, those in private research universities had the highest average total income ($74,732). Faculty in public research universities also had higher than average total income ($58,309). Those in public comprehensive, public two-year, and liberal arts institutions had lower than average total incomes, earning $42,965, $38,539, and $32,740, respectively.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty is being conducted in compliance with the mandate stated in section 406(g) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Education Amendments of 1988 (Public Law 100-297).

The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 [20 U.S.C. 1232g] allows the release of institutional record information to the Secretary of Education or his agent without prior consent of survey members, in connection with the enforcement of Federal legal requirements [20 U.S.C. 1232g (b) (3)]. Since NCES is an authorized representative of the Secretary of Education, compliance with an NCES official request for information constitutes compliance with the laws cited above.

Strict confidentiality of all information obtained from NSOPF is assured by current federal laws and regulations. Public Law 100-297 established that all records on individuals must be kept confidential by NCES and its contractors under penalty of law. Researchers are subject to fines and imprisonment for misuse or disclosure of individual data.

Procedures have been implemented to ensure confidentiality and privacy of all information obtained. Specifically:

- All project staff with any access to study data have signed an affidavit of nondisclosure which subjects them to possible fines and imprisonment for any disclosure of individual responses.
- All electronic data are maintained in secure and protected data files, and all personally identifying information is maintained in files separate from files containing descriptive information.
- Any data released to the general public (for example, statistical tables) will be tailored so that it is not possible to identify specific individuals or institutions.

Appendix L

Letters to Faculty Questionnaire Respondents

Initial Cover Letter to Faculty

Second Faculty Questionnaire Mailing

Third Faculty Questionnaire Mailing

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

NSOPF-93
Endorsed by:

- *American Association for Higher Education*
- *American Association of Community and Junior Colleges*
- *American Association of State Colleges and Universities*
- *American Association of University Professors*
- *American Federation of Teachers*
- *Association for Institutional Research*
- *Association of American Colleges*
- *Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities*
- *College and University Personnel Association*
- *The College Board*
- *Council of Graduate Schools*
- *National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education*
- *National Education Association*
- *National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities*
- *The United Negro College Fund, Inc.*

Dear Faculty Member:

I am writing to ask you to participate in the **1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty** (NSOPF-93) by completing the enclosed questionnaire. Your institution has provided us with a complete list of its faculty from which your name was randomly selected. As part of a nationally representative sample, your participation, while voluntary, is vital to the study's success.

NSOPF-93 is the most comprehensive study of higher education faculty ever undertaken. It will collect data from a nationally representative sample of 32,000 faculty in 800 higher education institutions. The study is being conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education with additional support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation. The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago has been commissioned to collect the data for this study.

NSOPF-93 will construct a profile of faculty by gathering information on the backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, salaries, benefits, and attitudes of both full- and part-time instructional and non-instructional faculty in two- and four-year higher education institutions. Because faculty directly affect the quality of education in colleges and universities and perform much of the research and development work upon which the nation's technological and economic advancement depends, it is essential to understand who they are, what they do, and whether, how, and why they are changing. The enclosed brochure provides additional information about the study and its goals.

Let me assure you that your responses and all information that would permit identification of you or your institution will be kept strictly confidential in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Federal statutes governing privacy and with NCES' legislative mandate to protect the confidentiality of its respondents. The brochure cites the relevant statutes.

The questionnaire should take about 45 minutes to complete. You may send comments concerning this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D. C. 20202-4651; and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1850-0608, Washington, D. C. 20503.

-over-

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

Please return your completed Faculty Questionnaire in the accompanying NORC business-reply envelope within the next week. If you have any questions concerning the questionnaire or the study, please contact the Project Director, Dr. Sameer Abraham of NORC, toll-free at 1-800-733-NORC.

I thank you for your participation in this important study.

Sincerely,

EJ Elliott

Emerson J. Elliott
Commissioner

Enclosures

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

NSOPF-93
Endorsed by:

- *American Association for Higher Education*
- *American Association of Community and Junior Colleges*
- *American Association of State Colleges and Universities*
- *American Association of University Professors*
- *American Federation of Teachers*
- *Association for Institutional Research*
- *Association of American Colleges*
- *Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities*
- *College and University Personnel Association*
- *The College Board*
- *Council of Graduate Schools*
- *National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education*
- *National Education Association*
- *National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities*
- *The United Negro College Fund, Inc.*

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to ask you to respond to the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93), in which your institution is participating.

I want to thank you personally if you have already completed and returned your Faculty Questionnaire. If you did not receive the questionnaire, or have not yet returned it, please complete and return the enclosed copy within the *next five days*.

Faculty directly affect the quality of education in postsecondary institutions and perform much of the research and development work on which this nation's technological and economic advancement depends. NSOPF-93 is the first comprehensive study to provide a national profile of instructional and non-instructional faculty across a broad range of representative two-year, four-year, and doctoral-granting institutions. It is also the first to include instructional personnel who do not have faculty status.

As someone who plays a crucial role in higher education, we are certain that you can appreciate our need to obtain a completed questionnaire from each sampled faculty member. You were scientifically selected; no one can substitute for you. Without the participation of faculty like yourself, the results of this study will not adequately represent all faculty in the nation.

Individual responses and all information that would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be kept strictly confidential in accordance with the provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1976 and Section 406(d) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended by the Hawkins-Stafford Education Amendments of 1988, Public Law 100-297. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries.

I appreciate your contribution to this very important research. Should you have any questions, please call me toll-free at 1-800-733-6672.

Sincerely,

Sameer Y. Abraham, Ph.D.
NSOPF-93 Project Director

LTR2

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

NSOPF-93
Endorsed by:

American Association for Higher Education
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
American Association of University Professors
American Federation of Teachers
Association for Institutional Research
Association of American Colleges
Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities
College and University Personnel Association
The College Board
Council of Graduate Schools
National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education
National Education Association
National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities
The United Negro College Fund, Inc.

Dear Colleague,

I am sending this third questionnaire packet to you because we have not heard from you, and the end date for the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty is almost upon us.

I want to thank you if you have already mailed in your completed Faculty Questionnaire. If you have not, please complete the enclosed copy and return it within the *next five days*. Your participation is absolutely crucial if we are to adequately represent the diversity of the nation's instructional and non-instructional faculty. You were scientifically selected and no one can substitute for you.

NSOPF-93 is the most comprehensive study of faculty ever conducted. This is the first study to provide a national profile of instructional and non-instructional faculty, both full-time and part-time, across a variety of two-year, four-year, and doctoral-granting institutions. It is also the first to include instructional personnel who do not have faculty status.

Again, let me assure you that your responses and all information that would permit identification of you or your institution will be kept strictly confidential in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Federal statutes governing privacy and the U.S. Department of Education's mandate to protect the confidentiality of its respondents. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries.

Please take this opportunity to complete the questionnaire now. I appreciate your contribution to this very important research. If you have any questions, call me toll-free at 1-800-733-6672.

Sincerely,

Sameer Y. Abraham, Ph.D.
NSOPF-93 Project Director

LTR3

Appendix M

Letters to Institution Questionnaire Respondents

Initial Cover Letter to Institutions That Provided Faculty Lists

Initial Cover Letter to Institutions That Did Not Provide Faculty Lists

Follow-up Postcard

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

NSOPF-93
Endorsed by:

American Association for Higher Education

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

American Association of University Professors

American Federation of Teachers

Association for Institutional Research

Association of American Colleges

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities

College and University Personnel Association

The College Board

Council of Graduate Schools

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

National Education Association

National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities

The United Negro College Fund, Inc.

Dear Institutional Representative:

The chief administrative officer of your institution has agreed to participate in the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) and has indicated that you could provide us with information concerning your institution's characteristics, policies, and practices. We have already received a list of your institution's faculty and have sampled 41 individuals from the list. Sampled faculty have been sent questionnaires that ask them to provide information on their backgrounds, responsibilities, workloads, compensation, and attitudes. The enclosed questionnaire asks for information that is important to know about the institutions in which faculty work.

NSOPF-93 is the most comprehensive study of faculty in higher educational institutions ever undertaken. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education is conducting the study with additional support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation. The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago has been commissioned to collect the data for this study.

Your participation, while voluntary, is critical for us to provide national estimates of higher education institutions' characteristics and policies toward their faculty. Such institutions are facing changing academic, fiscal, and political environments. To make realistic plans for the future of higher education, planners and policy makers at all levels--institutional, government, and legislative--will need reliable and current national data on available resources, as well as on the constraints and demands on higher education institutions. NSOPF-93 is collecting data from approximately 800 higher education institutions and 33,000 faculty members. The study will provide national profiles of faculty in American institutions of higher learning in 1993, and data on institutional policies and practices affecting faculty. NSOPF-93 is the second in a series that first collected data in 1988. The enclosed brochure provides additional information about the study and its goals.

The questionnaire should take about 45-60 minutes to complete. You may send comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1850-0608, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Individual responses and all information which would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be kept strictly confidential in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Federal statutes governing privacy and with NCES' legislative mandate to protect the confidentiality of its respondents. The brochure cites the relevant statutes. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries and will not be disclosed to any individual or group.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

Please complete the enclosed Institution Questionnaire and return it in the accompanying business-reply envelope within the next few weeks. If you have any questions concerning the questionnaire or the study, please contact the NORC Project Director, Dr. Sameer Abraham, toll-free, at 1-800-733-NORC.

Thank you for your participation in this important study. We will send you a copy of the final analytic report.

Sincerely,

EJ Elliott

Emerson J. Elliott
Commissioner

Enclosures

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

NSOPF-93
Endorsed by:

American Association for Higher Education

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

American Association of University Professors

American Federation of Teachers

Association for Institutional Research

Association of American Colleges

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities

College and University Personnel Association

The College Board

Council of Graduate Schools

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

National Education Association

National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities

The United Negro College Fund, Inc.

Dear Chief Administrative Officer:

Your institution has been selected into the sample of the 1992-93 **National Study of Postsecondary Faculty** (NSOPF-93). I am writing to ask for your institution's cooperation in this important study by completing the enclosed Institution Questionnaire. The questionnaire should be completed by an academic official, such as a Provost or Academic Dean, who can best respond to questions concerning your institution's characteristics, policies and practices towards its faculty.

NSOPF-93 is the most comprehensive study of faculty in postsecondary educational institutions ever undertaken. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education is conducting the study with additional support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation. The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago has been commissioned to collect the data for this study.

Your institution's participation, while voluntary, is critical for us to provide national estimates of higher education institutions' characteristics and policies toward their faculty. Such institutions are facing changing academic, fiscal, and political environments. To make realistic plans for the future of higher education, planners and policy makers at all levels--institutional, government, and legislative--will need reliable and current national data on available resources, as well as on the constraints and demands on higher education institutions. NSOPF is collecting data from approximately 800 higher education institutions and 33,000 faculty members. The study will provide national profiles of faculty in American institutions of higher learning in 1993, and data on institutional policies and practices affecting faculty. NSOPF-93 is the second in a series that first collected data in 1988. The enclosed brochure provides additional information about the study and its goals.

The questionnaire should take about 45-60 minutes to complete. You may send comments regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, to the U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1850-0608, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Individual responses and all information which would permit identification of individuals or institutions will be kept strictly confidential in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Federal statutes governing privacy and with NCES' legislative mandate to protect the confidentiality of its respondents. The brochure cites the relevant statutes. Responses will be used only in statistical summaries and will not be disclosed to any individual or group.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

The enclosed Institution Questionnaire should be completed and returned in the accompanying business-reply envelope within the next few weeks. If you have any questions concerning the questionnaire or the study, please contact the NORC Project Director, Dr. Sameer Abraham, toll-free, at 1-800-733-NORC.

Thank you for your participation in this important study. We will send you a copy of the final analytic report.

Sincerely,

E J Elliott

Emerson J. Elliott
Commissioner

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION • UNITED STATES OF AMERICA •

Did you mail back your NSOPF Institution Questionnaire?

If not, please complete it today. Current information about your institution is important to understand constraints and demands on the nation's higher education system.

Please return the questionnaire in the stamped, pre-addressed envelope. If you have any questions, please call our toll-free number 1-800-733-NORC.

If you've already returned back your questionnaire,

Thank you for your participation.

University of Chicago
National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637-2799

We need to hear from you!

National Study of Postsecondary Faculty
Sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics

Appendix N

Letter to Institution Coordinator for Faculty Follow-up

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

April 16, 1993

Dear Institution Coordinator:

Thank you for responding to our request for the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93), sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics.

As you requested, enclosed please find the individual questionnaire packets for the faculty sampled at your institution. We would appreciate your distributing these packets to the appropriate faculty members as soon as possible, so that they have ample time to complete the questionnaire.

We would like to take this opportunity to again thank you for your assistance, and to mention that we may need to recontact you to prompt any faculty members who do not return their questionnaires. Normally, we would attempt to contact nonresponding sample members ourselves, but we understand if some institutions would prefer to maintain the privacy of their staff members. In such cases, we would ask the Institution Coordinator to distribute additional questionnaire packets to nonresponding faculty members and prompt them to complete the questionnaire and return it to us as soon as possible.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to call us at 1-800-733-NORC. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Sameer Y. Abraham, Ph.D.
NSOPF-93 Project Director

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208—

Appendix O

Derived Variables

Exhibit O-1: Discipline Crosswalk, NSOPF 1988-1993

Exhibit O-2: Derived Variable Crosswalk to NSOPF-88

1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty
Documentation of Derived Variable Creation

This document describes how the derived variables were created that accompany the NSOPF-93 institution and restricted public use faculty data files. The derived variables appear after the survey variables at the end of each data file, and are listed here in the order in which they appear. A total of 143 derived variables have been created. The faculty file includes all 143 derived variables. The institution file contains 36 institution-level derived variables.

All faculty-level derived variables were created by NORC using data collected from the NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire. Most of the institution-level derived variables were created using multiple sources of data including: the 1991-92 IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System), the "Carnegie classification" system[1], and NSOPF-93 sampling information. NCES created the derived variables based on IPEDS.

In this document, the SAS variable name of each derived variable appears in ***UPPER CASE BOLD ITALICS*** on the left-hand side of the page. Each variable name begins with the letter "***X***". The second and third elements of the variable name indicate in what order the derived variable was created from the primary survey variable or other source (e.g., ***X01***, ***X02***, ***X03***, etc.).

Institution-level derived variables. The last element of the SAS variable name for institution-level derived variables consists of two characters, an underscore and a zero "***_0***" (e.g., ***X01_0***, ***X02_0***, ***X03_0***, etc.). This component of the variable name signifies both that the variable is an institution-level derived variable and that an outside data source was used when creating it (derived variables ***X01_0*** through ***X37_0***). The example below is a variable derived from IPEDS data; the "***_0***" indicates that it is an institution-level variable. The variable title (created for purposes of this document) appears below the variable name. Below that is the CODE which defines the value of the variable. In this example, because it is reported as an open-ended percentage, the value will vary from 0 to 100.

X27_0
Minority enrollment: Percent American Indian/Alaskan Native
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to provide the percentage of American Indian/Alaskan native enrollment at each NSOPF-93 institution.

American Indian or Alaskan Native. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

---

[1] *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.* The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Princeton, New Jersey: 1987).

Faculty-level derived variables. The SAS variable names of faculty-level derived variables also begin with the letter "*X*". The second and third digits of the faculty-level derived variable name indicate the order that the variable was created from the primary survey variable. The last component of the derived variable name reflects the section and question in the NSOPF-93 Faculty Questionnaire from which the variable originated.

In the example below, "*_01*" in the derived variable name, ***X01A7***, indicates that this is the first variable derived from survey variable A7, which is in Section A of the Faculty Questionnaire. The CODE identifies the values for the derived variable, keying them to the survey variables' original coding scheme (i.e. X01A7's value 4 is equivalent to A7's values 4 and/or 5). The description explains how the survey variable (A7) was collapsed to create the derived variable.

X01A7

Tenure: Tenure status

CODE:

1=Tenured (Q7=1)

2=On tenure track but not tenured (Q7=2)

3=Not on tenure track (Q7=3)

4=No tenure system for respondent's faculty status or no tenure system at institution (Q7=4 or 5)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable A7 to indicate tenure status of a faculty respondent during the 1992 Fall Term; codes for "no tenure system for respondent's faculty status" and "no tenure system at this institution" have been merged into one category.

Survey variables from questions in the preface of the NSOPF-93 Faculty Questionnaire have a leading underscore in place of a section letter (e.g., *_1*, *_1A*, etc.). Derived variables based on the questions begin with the letter "*X*" and a number indicating order of creation, followed by the name of the survey variable (e.g., ***X01_1, X02_2, etc.***).

Exhibit O-1 contains a list of the academic disciplines and codes used in several NSOPF-93 derived variables and provides a cross-walk to the NSOPF-88 discipline codes. Exhibit O-2 contains the derived variable titles in alphabetical order, and a cross-walk to the NSOPF-88 derived variable titles.

The SAS implementation for each derived variable created by NORC was tested using an iterative process. Special programs were written in order to generate values for each of the derived variables from selected subsamples of observations from the faculty data set. The output from these reports was then checked against a set of values that were manually computed according to the specifications for the derived variable. Whenever discrepancies appeared, both the program implementation and manual computations were rechecked for logical consistency and errors, after which the programs were revised accordingly until the problems were corrected. This process was repeated for each derived variable to ensure that the variables were created in accordance with NCES specifications.

Institution-level derived variables

X01_0

Institution strata (matches NSOPF-88 categories)

CODE:
1=Public research (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=11 or 12)
2=Private research (I_AFF=2, I_CNG=11 or 12)
3=Public doctoral, including medical (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=13 or 14 or 52)
4=Private doctoral, including medical (I_AFF=2, I_CNG=13 or 14 or 52)
5=Public comprehensive (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=21 or 22)
6=Private comprehensive (I_AFF=2, I_CNG=21 or 22)
7=Liberal arts (I_CNG=31 or 32)
8=Public two-year (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=40)
9=Other, includes religious and other specialized institutions, except medical; private 2-year institutions not included (I_CNG=51, 53-65)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to indicate the modified 1987 Carnegie classification for the institutions sampled for NSOPF-93. The *X01_0* categories match the NSOPF-88 categories used in some NCES publications. A modified Carnegie system was used to stratify institutions by control (public and private) and type (research, other Ph.D., comprehensive, liberal arts, medical, two-year, religious, other and unknown.) Specific Carnegie classifications are defined at *X05_0*. (Note: Private two-year schools are not included in any of the individual categories).

Control

I_AFF=1 — Public
I_AFF=2 — Private

Type

I_CNG=11 or 12 — Research
I_CNG=13 or 14 — Other Ph.D.
I_CNG=21 or 22 — Comprehensive
I_CNG=31 or 32 — Liberal arts
I_CNG=40 — Two-year college
I_CNG=51 — Religious
I_CNG=52 — Medical
I_CNG=53 to 65 — Other

For NSOPF-93 institutions with unknown Carnegie classifications, the value of *X01_0* was individually assigned based on information available from IPEDS

X02_0

Institution strata (modified NSOPF-88 categories)

CODE:

1=Public research (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=11 or 12)
2=Private research (I_AFF=2, I_CNG=11 or 12)
3=Public doctoral, including medical (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=13 or 14 or 52)
4=Private doctoral, including medical (I_AFF=2, I_CNG=13 or 14 or 52)
5=Public comprehensive (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=21 or 22)
6=Private comprehensive (I_AFF=2, I_CNG=21 or 22)
7=Private liberal arts (I_AFF=2, I_CNG=31 or 32)
8=Public two-year (I_AFF=1, I_CNG=40)
9=Other, including private 2-year institutions, public liberal arts institutions and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical (I_AFF=1 and I_CNG=31 or 32, I_AFF=2 and I_CNG=40, I_CNG=51, 53-65)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This variable is a modification of *X01_0*. The categories for Codes 1-6 and 8 correspond to categories used in NSOPF-88 (as in *X01_0*). Code 7, previously labeled "liberal arts", has been modified to include only private liberal arts institutions. Code 9, "other", now includes public liberal arts, private two-year institutions, and religious and other specialized institutions. (Specific Carnegie classifications are defined at *X05_0*.) This variable creates the "institution type and control" stratification used in tables in the NCES reports *Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education* [NCES 97-080] and *Instructional Faculty and Staff in Higher Education Institutions: Fall 1987 and Fall 1992* [NCES 97-470].

For NSOPF-93 institutions with unknown Carnegie classifications, the value of *X02_0* was individually assigned based on information available from IPEDS.

X04_0

Institution strata (modified NSOPF-93 sampling strata; unknown private and unknown public eliminated; stratum 15 split into 3 strata: public research, private research, public other Ph.D.)

CODE:

1=Private other Ph.D.
2=Public comprehensive
3=Private comprehensive
4=Public liberal arts
5=Private liberal arts
6=Public medical
7=Private medical
8=Private religious
9=Public two year
10=Private two year
11=Public other
12=Private other
13=Public research
14=Private research
15=Public other Ph.D.

Description of the Derived Variable:

This variable is a modification of the sampling strata of the NSOPF-93 institutions. A modified 1987 Carnegie classification system was used to stratify institutions by type and control. (Specific Carnegie classifications are defined at *X05_0*.) There were two levels of control, public and private, and nine types: research, other Ph.D., comprehensive, liberal arts, medical, religious, two-year schools, other, and unknown. The unknown sampling strata (stratum 13 and stratum 14 in the ISTRATUM sampling variable on the data file) for institutions for which a Carnegie classification was not available have been eliminated for this derived variable. There are no public religious institutions. Three of the cells, public research, private research, and public "other Ph.D.", were sampled at 100%, and grouped together in the "certainty" stratum (stratum 15 in the ISTRATUM sampling variable on the data file). Because this stratum does not contain a grouping of analytic interest, the sampling strata for this derived variable have been modified so that institutions previously contained in the "certainty" stratum are split into 3 separate strata:

-Public research
-Private research
-Public other Ph.D.

X05_0

Institution by Carnegie classification I or II (1987) (public or private sort eliminated)

CODE:

1=Research I
2=Research II
3=Doctoral I
4=Doctoral II
5=Comprehensive I
6=Comprehensive II
7=Liberal arts I
8=Liberal arts II
9=Two year
10=Other

Description of the Derived Variable:

This variable sorts institutions sampled for NSOPF-93 according to their specific Carnegie classification (rather than the modified 1987 Carnegie classification system utilized in *X01_0*, which sorted institutions according to their public or private designation). These Carnegie classifications incorporate information from the Carnegie Foundation's *1994 Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. (The institution sample was stratified following the 1987 Carnegie classifications, as noted in Chapter 3.) The 1994 Carnegie classifications are as follows:

Research I:	offer a full range of baccalaureate through doctoral programs, award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year, give high priority to research and receive $40 million or more in federal support annually
Research II:	offer a full range of baccalaureate through doctoral programs, award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year, give high priority to research and receive between $15.5 and $40 million in federal support annually
Doctoral I:	offer a full range of baccalaureate through doctoral programs and award at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in five or more disciplines
Doctoral II:	offer a full range of baccalaureate through doctoral programs and award at least 10 doctoral degrees annually in three or more disciplines, or 20 or more doctoral degrees in one or more disciplines
Comprehensive I:	offer a full range of baccalaureate through master's degree programs and award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines
Comprehensive II:	offer a full range of baccalaureate through master's degree programs and award 20 or more master's degrees annually in one or more disciplines
Liberal arts (or baccalaureate colleges) I:	offer primarily undergraduate degrees, award 40% or more of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields and are restrictive in admissions

Liberal arts (or baccalaureate colleges) II:

offer primarily undergraduate degrees, award less than 40% of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields and are less restrictive in admissions

Two year (associate of arts colleges):

offer primarily associate of arts certificate or degree programs, and with few exceptions, do not offer baccalaureate degrees (this group includes community, junior and technical colleges)

Other: offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctoral, with at least 50% of the degrees awarded in a single discipline (including institutions whose primary purpose is to offer religious instruction or train members of the clergy; medical schools and medical centers who award most of their professional degrees in medicine and in some instances, in other health professional programs; other separate health professional schools that award most of their degrees in fields such as chiropractic, nursing, pharmacy or podiatry; schools of engineering and technology; schools of business and management; schools of art, music and design; schools of law; teachers colleges; other specialized institutions such as graduate centers, maritime academies, military institutions and institutions that do not fit other classifications; tribal colleges and universities, primarily tribally contracted and located on reservations).

For NSOPF-93 institutions with unknown Carnegie classifications, the value of *X05_0* was individually assigned based on information available from IPEDS.

X06_0

Institution type (1991-92 IPEDS and modified Carnegie)

CODE:
1=Four year (I_TYP=4)
2=Two year (I_TYP=2)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to reflect the type of institution (two- or four-year) sampled for NSOPF-93.

X07_0

Institution control (1991-92 IPEDS and modified Carnegie)

CODE:
1=Public (I_AFF=1)
2=Private (I_AFF=2)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to reflect the public or private status of the NSOPF-93 institution.

X08_0

Institution strata (NSOPF-88 categories modified further)

CODE:
1=Four-year public doctoral (medical schools and research institutions)
2=Four-year private doctoral (medical schools and research institutions)
3=Four-year public non-doctoral (comprehensive, liberal arts, and other specialized institutions)
4=Four-year private non-doctoral (comprehensive, liberal arts, and other specialized institutions)
5=Two-year public
6=Two-year private

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable is a modification of *X01_0*. For this derived variable, institutions are grouped by four-year and two-year designations, by control (public and private), and by types of degrees offered (doctoral and non-doctoral).

For NSOPF-93 institutions with unknown Carnegie classifications (defined at X05_0), the value of *X08_0* was individually assigned based on information available from IPEDS.

X09_0

Institution strata (NSOPF-88 and modified 1994 Carnegie)

CODE:
1=Public research
2=Private research
3=Public doctoral-including medical
4=Private doctoral-including medical
5=Public comprehensive
6=Private comprehensive
7=Private liberal arts
8=Public two-year
9=Other

Description of the Derived Variable:

This variable was created to reflect the 1994 Carnegie classification and public or private status of each NSOPF-93 institution. The categories correspond to the modified 1988 NSOPF categories at *X02_0*.

For NSOPF-93 institutions with unknown Carnegie classifications, the value of *X09_0* was individually assigned based on information available from IPEDS.

X10_0
Ratio of FTE enrollment/FTE faculty
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the ratio of FTE enrollment to FTE faculty at NSOPF-93 institutions. These terms are defined as follows:

Full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment: The sum of the number of full-time students and the full-time equivalency of part-time students.

Full-time equivalent (FTE) of part-time enrollment: A numeric conversion through which a student attending part-time is considered some fraction of a full-time student. The actual fractions used were:

.38 for part-time undergraduates and graduate students
.50 for first-professional students

Full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty: The sum of the number of full-time faculty and the full-time equivalency of part-time faculty.

Full-time equivalent (FTE) of part-time faculty: A numeric conversion through which a faculty member employed part-time is considered some fraction of a faculty member employed full-time. The actual fraction used was .56.

X11_0
Institution size: Number of full- and part-time undergraduate students enrolled
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the number of undergraduate students enrolled in courses for credit at NSOPF-93 institutions.

Undergraduate: A student enrolled in a four-year or five-year bachelor's degree program, in an associate's degree program, or in a vocational or technical program below the baccalaureate, or any other student that is not seeking a degree but is enrolled in courses for credit.

X12_0
Institution size collapsed: Number of full- and part-time under-graduate students enrolled
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X11_0* into five ranges.

X13_0

Institution size: FTE undergraduate enrollment

CODE:

(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show FTE undergraduate enrollment at NSOPF-93 institutions.

FTE: Full-time equivalency of undergraduate students as defined at *X10_0*.

Undergraduate: A student enrolled in a four-year or five-year bachelor's degree program, in an associate's degree program, or in a vocational or technical program below the baccalaureate, or any other student that is not seeking a degree but is enrolled in courses for credit.

X14_0

Institution size collapsed: FTE undergraduate enrollment

CODE:

(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X13_0* into five ranges.

X15_0

Institution size: Number of first-professional students enrolled

CODE:

(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the number of first-professional students enrolled at NSOPF-93 institutions.

First-professional student: A student enrolled in any of the following degree programs:

Chiropractic (D.C. or D.C.M.)
Dentistry (D.D.S. or D.M.D.)
Medicine (M.D.)
Optometry (O.D.)
Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.)
Pharmacy (D.Phar.)
Podiatry (Pod.D. or D.P.)
Veterinary Medicine(D.V.M.)
Law (L.L.B., J.D.)
Theology (M.Div. or M.H.L. or B.D.)

X16_0

Institution size collapsed: Number of first-professional students enrolled

CODE:

(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X15_0* into five ranges.

X17_0
Institution size: FTE first-professional enrollment
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the number of FTE first-professional students enrolled at NSOPF-93 institutions.

FTE: Full-time equivalency of first-professional students as defined at *X10_0*.

First-professional student: A student enrolled in any of the following degree programs:

Chiropractic (D.C. or D.C.M.)
Dentistry (D.D.S. or D.M.D.)
Medicine (M.D.)
Optometry (O.D.)
Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.)
Pharmacy (D.Phar.)
Podiatry (Pod.D. or D.P.)
Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.)
Law (L.L.B., J.D.)
Theology (M.Div. or M.H.L. or B.D.)

X18_0
Institution size collapsed: FTE first-professional enrollment
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X17_0* into five ranges.

X19_0
Institution size: Number of graduate students enrolled
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the total enrollment of graduate students at NSOPF-93 institutions.

Graduate student: A student who holds a bachelor's or first-professional degree, or equivalent, and is taking courses for credit at the post-baccalaureate level. These students may or may not be enrolled in a graduate degree program.

X20_0
Institution size collapsed: Number of graduate students enrolled
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X19_0* into five ranges.

X21_0
Institution size: FTE graduate enrollment
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the number of FTE graduate students at NSOPF-93 institutions.

FTE: Full-time equivalency of graduate students as defined at *X10_0*.

Graduate student: A student who holds a bachelor's or first-professional degree, or equivalent, and is taking courses for credit at the post-baccalaureate level. These students may or may not be enrolled in a graduate degree program.

X22_0
Institution size collapsed: FTE graduate enrollment
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X21_0* into five ranges.

X23_0
Institution size: Total enrollment
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the size of the total student enrollment at NSOPF-93 institutions.

Total enrollment: All students taking courses for credit.

X24_0
Institution size collapsed: Total enrollment
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X23_0* into five ranges.

X25_0
Institution size: Total FTE enrollment
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to provide the total FTE student enrollment at NSOPF-93 institutions.

Full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment: The sum of the number of full-time students and the full-time equivalency of part-time students.

Full-time equivalent (FTE) of part-time enrollment: A numeric conversion through which a student attending part-time is considered some fraction of a full-time student. The actual fractions used were:

.38 for part-time undergraduates and graduate students
.50 for part-time first-professional students

X26_0
Institution size collapsed: Total FTE enrollment
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X25_0* into five ranges.

X27_0
Minority enrollment: Percent American Indian/Alaskan Native
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to provide the percentage of American Indian/Alaskan Native enrollment at each NSOPF-93 institution.

American Indian or Alaskan Native: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

X28_0
Minority enrollment: Percent Asian/Pacific Islander
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from 1991-92 IPEDS data to provide the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander enrollment at each NSOPF-93 institution.

Asian or Pacific Islander: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or Pacific Islands. This includes people from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, American Samoa, India, and Vietnam.

X29_0
Minority enrollment: Percent Black Non-Hispanic
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from 1991-92 IPEDS data to provide the percentage of Black Non-Hispanic enrollment at each NSOPF-93 institution.

Black, Non-Hispanic: A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa (except those of Hispanic origins).

X30_0
Minority enrollment: Percent Hispanic
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from 1991-92 IPEDS data to provide the percentage of Hispanic enrollment at each NSOPF-93 institution.

Hispanic: A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

X31_0
Institution expenditures: Instruction
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from the 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the level of instructional expenditures at NSOPF-93 institutions.

Instruction (expenditures): Expenditures of the colleges, schools, departments, and other instructional divisions of the institution, and expenditures for departmental research and public service that are not separately budgeted. Includes expenditures for credit and non-credit activities. Excludes expenditures for academic administration where the primary function is administration (e.g., academic deans). This category also includes general academic instruction, occupational and vocational instruction, special session instruction, community education, preparatory and adult basic education, and remedial and tutorial instruction conducted by the teaching faculty for the institution's students.

X32_0
Institution expenditures collapsed: Instruction
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X31_0* into five ranges.

X33_0
Institution expenditures: Research
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the funds expended for research by NSOPF-93 institutions.

Research (expenditures): Funds expended for activities specifically organized to produce research outcomes and commissioned by an agency either external to the institution or separately budgeted by an organizational unit within the institution.

X34_0
Institution expenditures collapsed: Research
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X33_0* into five ranges.

X35_0
Institution expenditures: Educational and general
CODE:
(open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to show the level of educational and general expenditures at NSOPF-93 institutions.

Educational and general (E&G) expenditures: Educational and general expenditures include current fund expenditures for instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation and maintenance of plant, scholar-ships and fellowships, and educational and general mandatory transfers. Educational and general expenditures exclude expenditures on auxiliary enterprises, hospitals, and independent operations. Pell Grants are excluded.

X36_0
Institution expenditures collapsed: Educational and general
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES to recode the continuous categories at *X35_0* into five ranges.

X37_0
Bureau of Economic Analysis region code
CODE:
0=U.S. service school
1=New England
2=Mid East
3=Great Lakes
4=Plains
5=Southeast
6=Southwest
7=Rocky Mountain
8=Far West
9=Outlying areas

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by NCES from 1991-92 IPEDS data to classify NSOPF-93 institutions according to geographic region, using the nine BEA (Bureau of Economic Analysis) region codes.

Faculty questionnaire derived variables

X01_1
Role: Any instructional duties for credit
CODE:
1=Yes (Q1=1, Q1A=1 or 2)
2=No (Q1=1, Q1A=3 or Q1=2)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This variable was created from NSOPF-93 faculty survey data to indicate whether respondents had any instructional duties for credit during the 1992 Fall Term at the institution from which they were sampled. This included teaching one or more courses for credit, or advising or supervising academic activities for credit, e.g. individualized instruction. SAS variables _1 and _1A were the basis for this variable. SAS variable _1 has a value of 1 if a respondent had any instructional duties in the 1992 Fall term, and 2 if they did not. SAS variable _1A is 1 if all the respondent's instructional duties were related to credit courses, advising, or supervising academic activities for credit; 2 if only some duties were; and 3 if all the respondent's instructional duties were related to non-credit courses, advising, or supervising non-credit academic activities.

In the NCES report *Instructional Faculty and Staff in Higher Education Institutions: Fall 1987 and Fall 1992*, this variable was used to select instructional faculty for comparisons between 1987 and 1992. Those respondents coded "yes" (i.e., X01_1=1) were selected for the comparisons in that report.

The faculty data file was re-weighted after the release of this publication. Current estimates based upon this variable will not match earlier estimates.

X02_1

Role: Specific duties and faculty status

CODE:

1=Any instructional duties for credit with faculty status (Q1=1, Q1A=1 or 2, Q3=1)
2=Any instructional duties for credit without faculty status (Q1=1, Q1A=1 or 2, Q3=2 or 3)
3=Non-instructional duties, mainly research (Q1=2, Q2=2)
4=Non-instructional duties, mainly administration (Q1=2, Q2=6 or 9 or above)
5=Non-instructional duties, mainly other (Q1=2, Q2 NE 1, 2, or 6 or 9 or above)
6=Instructional duties not for credit with faculty status (Q1=1, Q1A=3, Q3=1)
7=Instructional duties not for credit without faculty status (Q1=1, Q1A=3, Q3=2 or 3)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to indicate faculty status for respondents who had any instructional duties, and the nature of their principal activity (at the institution from which they were sampled), for respondents who had no instructional duties for credit during the 1992 Fall term.

The derived variable was created from SAS variables _1, _1A, _2 and _3. SAS variable _1 has a value of 1 if a respondent had any instructional duties, and 2 if they did not. SAS variable _1A is 1 if all the respondent's instructional duties were related to credit courses, or advising, or supervising academic activities for credit; 2 if only some duties were; and 3 if all the respondent's instructional duties were related to non-credit courses, or advising, or supervising non-credit academic activities. SAS variable _2 has a value of 1 if the respondent answered teaching was their principal activity; 2 if research; 3 if technical activities; 4 if clinical services; 5 if community/public service; 6 if administration (unspecified), or 9-23 if administration (specified); 7 if the respondent was on sabbatical; 8 if subsidized performer, artist in residence, etc; and 24 for a written response that could not be coded (other). SAS variable _3 has a value of 1 if the respondent had faculty status, 2 if the respondent did not have faculty status, and 3 if no one had faculty status at the respondent's institution.

Codes 9-23 for SAS variable _2, created from respondent verbatims entered at code 6 to specify type of administrative activity, are as follows:

9=Dean, Acting/Interim/Associate/Assistant Dean
10=Chair, Acting/Associate/Assistant Chair
11=Director/Head/Coordinator (of a program, group, field of study)
12=President, Chief
13=Assistant to the President
14=Vice President, Associate/Assistant Vice President
15=Administrator, Manager
16=Chancellor, Provost
17=Chaplain
18=Advisor, Counselor
19=Librarian, Library Director
20=Registrar
21=Secretary, miscellaneous clerical
22=Adjunct (unspecified)
23=Athletic Director, Coach

X03_1

Role: Duties collapsed

CODE:
- 1=Any instructional duties for credit
- 2=Non-instructional duties, mainly research
- 3=Non-instructional duties, mainly administration
- 4=Non-credit instructional duties with faculty status or non-instructional duties, mainly other
- 5=No instructional duties for credit, no faculty status

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by recoding derived variable *X02_1* in order to sort respondents with any instructional duties for credit (regardless of faculty status) from respondents with faculty status who did not have any instructional duties for credit or whose main non-instructional duties were not in research or administration. Respondents with faculty status whose main responsibility was research or administration are sorted into two other categories, and, finally, respondents without faculty status and only non-credit teaching duties are in a separate category.

X04_1

Role: Instructional duties by faculty status

CODE:
- 1=Any instructional duties for credit with faculty status
- 2=No instructional duties for credit with faculty status
- 3=Any instructional duties for credit without faculty status
- 4=No instructional duties for credit, without faculty status

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by recoding of derived variable *X02_1* in order to sort respondents by instructional duties and faculty status.

X05_1

Role: Faculty status or instructional duties for credit

CODE:
- 1=Faculty status or instructional duties for credit
- 2=Neither faculty status nor instructional duties for credit

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by recoding derived variable *X02_1* to separate respondents who had either faculty status or instructional duties for credit, from respondents who did not have faculty status and whose teaching was all non-credit.

X06_1
Role: Duties modified

CODE:
1=Any instructional duties for credit with faculty status
2=Any instructional duties for credit without faculty status
3=Non-instructional duties, mainly research
4=Non-instructional duties, mainly administration
5=Non-credit instructional duties with faculty status and non-instructional duties, mainly other
6=No instruction for credit and no faculty status

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created by recoding derived variable *X02_1* in order to separate instructional duties for credit by faculty status and to merge non-credit instructional duties with faculty status, with non-instructional duties other than research or administration. In order to be included in the teaching category an individual had to have some instructional duties for credit.

X07_1
Role: Any instruction for credit with teaching as primary activity

CODE:
1=Yes
2=No

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to indicate whether the respondent indicated that their primary activity was teaching (based on SAS variable _2) and that at least some of their teaching responsibilities were related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit (SAS variable _1A).

X01_2
Primary activity, all (non-credit teachers included)

CODE:
1=Teaching (Q2=1)
2=Research (Q2=2)
3=Administration (Q2=6 or 9 or above)
4=Other (Q2 NE 1,2 or 6 or 9 or above)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to indicate each respondent's primary activity at their sampled institution during the 1992 Fall term, based on SAS variable _2. Those respondents who answered that their primary activity was technical activities, clinical service, community/public service, on sabbatical, or other activities were coded as "other" at *X01_2*. (The values of SAS variable _2 appear in the description of derived variable *X02_1*.)

X02_2

Primary activity, modified

CODE:
1=Teaching (at least some instructional duties for credit)
2=Research
3=Administration
4=Other duties (including non-credit teaching, with faculty status)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by recoding derived variable *X01_2* to separate non-credit teaching from at least some teaching for credit. Non-credit teaching with faculty status is merged with other non-instructional duties. Non-credit teaching without faculty status is not included in this variable.

X01A4

Employment: Part-time faculty position only employment

CODE:
1=Yes (Q4=1 and Q17=1)
2=No (Q4=2, or Q4=1 and Q17=2)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to identify a respondent whose sole employment during the 1992 Fall Term was as a part-time faculty member at their sampled institution, based on responses at SAS variable A4 (full-time/part-time status) and SAS variable B17 (other employment during the 1992 Fall term).

X01A6

Employment: Number of years in current position at institution (1993 minus Q6)

CODE:
(NUMBER YEARS, open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to indicate the number of years a respondent has been at the position held during the 1992 Fall Term at their sampled institution, based on the year began at SAS variable A6.

X01A7

Tenure: Tenure status

CODE:
1=Tenured (Q7=1)
2=On tenure track but not tenured (Q7=2)
3=Not on tenure track (Q7=3)
4=No tenure system for respondent's faculty status or no tenure system at institution (Q7=4 or 5)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable A7 to indicate tenure status of a respondent during the 1992 Fall Term; codes for "no tenure system for respondent's faculty status" and "no tenure system at this institution" have been merged into one category.

X02A7

Tenure: Number of years tenured (1993 minus Q7A)

CODE:

(NUMBER YEARS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable A7A to provide a calculation of the number of years a respondent has been tenured.

X01A9

Academic rank

CODE:

1=Not applicable, no ranks designated at institution (Q9=NA)
2=Full Professor (Q9=1)
3=Associate Professor (Q9=2)
4=Assistant Professor (Q9=3)
5=Instructor (Q9=4)
6=Lecturer (Q9=5)
7=Other ranks (Q9=any "other" category)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable A9 to identify a respondent's academic rank, title or position at their sampled institution or to identify the fact that ranks are not assigned. SAS variable A9 has a value of 1 if the respondent was a full professor, 2 if an associate professor, 3 if an assistant professor, 4 if an instructor, 5 if a lecturer, 6 if an unspecified "other rank", and 7 or above if "other rank" was specified. The reserve code used for NA (not applicable)= -5. Codes 7-25, created from respondent verbatims entered at code 6 to specify type of rank, are as follows:

7=Visiting Faculty/Teacher/or unspecified
8=Professor Emeritus
9=Dean
10=Chairperson
11=Director, Head, Coordinator, Executive
12=Administration, Administrator
13=Management, Supervisor
14=Post-doctoral
15=Research Fellow/Scientist/Professor
16=President, Chancellor
17=Chaplain
18=Counselor, Mentor, Advisor
19=Librarian, Curator
20=Research Associate/Assistant
21=Secretary, miscellaneous clerical
22=Adjunct Faculty/Teacher/or unspecified
23=Coach
24=No title, no rank
25=Other

X01A10
Academic rank: Number of years since rank achieved (1993-Q10)
CODE:
(NUMBER YEARS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of years since a respondent first achieved the academic rank held in the 1992 Fall term, based on the year entered at SAS variable A10.

X01A11
Appointment type
CODE:
1=Regular (Q11 NE 1,2, or 3)
2=Temporary (Q11=1,2, or 3)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to determine the type of appointment held by a respondent at their sampled institution in the Fall of 1992. SAS variables A11_1 through A11_7 were used to create this variable. A11 _1=an acting appointment, A11_2=affiliate or adjunct, A11_3=visiting, A11_4=assigned by religious order, A11_5=clinical, A11_6=research, and A11_7=none of the above. A11_1, A11_2 or A11_3 are considered temporary appointments; A11_4 through A11_7 are considered regular appointments.

X02A11
Appointment type and employment status
CODE:
1=Full-time, regular (Q4=2, Q11 NE 1,2, or 3)
2=Full-time, temporary (Q4=2, Q11=1,2, or 3)
3=Part-time, regular (Q4=1, Q11 NE 1,2, or 3)
4=Part-time, temporary (Q4=1, Q11=1,2, or 3)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to indicate a respondent's type of appointment as well as full- or part-time employment status at their sampled institution, based on SAS variable A4 and derived variable *X01A11*. If SAS variable A4 is 1, the respondent worked part-time. If it is 2, the respondent worked full-time. *X01A11* was used to determine the type of appointment. If *X01A11*=1, the appointment is regular. If *X01A11*=2, the appointment is temporary.

X01A12
Program area: Teaching categories (matches NSOPF-88 categories)
CODE:
1=Agriculture and home economics (Q12=100-110, 350; includes agribusiness (101), agricultural sciences (102), renewable resources (103), other agriculture (110), and home economics (350))
2=Business (Q12=160-170; includes business (160), accounting (161), banking and finance (162), business administration and management (163), business administrative support (164), human resources development (165), organizational behavior (166), marketing and distribution (167) and other business (170))

3=Education (Q12=220-250; includes general education (221), basic skills (222), bilingual and cross-cultural education (223), curriculum and instruction (224), education administration (225), education evaluation and research (226), educational psychology (227) special ed. (228), student counseling and personnel services (229) other education (230), teacher education-unspecified (240), pre-elementary (241), elementary (242), secondary (243), adult and continuing (244), other general teacher ed. programs (245) and teacher ed. in specific subjects (250))

4=Engineering (Q12=260-280; includes general, civil, mechanical, chemical, and other engineering (261-270), engineering-related technologies (280))

5=Fine arts (Q12=140-150, includes art history and appreciation (141), crafts (142), dance (143), design (144), dramatic arts (145), film arts (146), fine arts (147), music (148), music history and appreciation (149), and other visual or performing arts (150))

6=Health sciences (Q12=330-340; includes health sciences-unspecified (330), allied health technologies (331), dentistry (332), health services administration (333), medicine (334), nursing (335), pharmacy (336), public health (337), veterinary medicine (338), and other health sciences (340))

7=Humanities (Q12=290-320, 480, 548; includes general English (291), composition (292), American lit. (293), English lit. (294), linguistics (295), speech (296), English as second language (297), other English (300), foreign languages-unspecified (310), Chinese (311), French (312), German (313), Italian (314), Latin (315), Japanese (316), other Asian (317), Russian (318), Spanish (319), other foreign languages (320), philosophy and religion (480), and history (548))

8=Natural sciences (Q12=200-210, 390-440; includes computer science-unspecified (200), computer and information sciences (201), computer programming (202), data processing (203), systems analysis (204), other computer science (210), biological sciences-unspecified (390), biochemistry (391), biology (392), botany (393), genetics (394), immunology (395), microbiology (396), physiology (397), zoology (398), other biological sciences (400), physical sciences-unspecified (410), astronomy (411), chemistry (412), physics (413), geological sciences (414), other physical sciences (420), mathematics (430), and statistics (440))

9=Social sciences (Q12=510, 540-547, 549-560; includes psychology (510), social sciences-unspecified (540), general social sciences (541), anthropology (542), archeology (543), area and ethnic studies (544), demography (545), economics (546), geography (547) international relations (549), political science (550), sociology (551), and other social sciences (560))

10=All other fields (Q12=120-130, 180-190, 360, 370, 380, 450, 460, 470, 490, 500, 520, 530, 570-900; includes architecture (120-130), communications (180-190), industrial arts (360), law (370), library and archival sciences (380), military studies (450), multi-interdisciplinary studies (460), parks and recreation (470), theology (490), protective services (500), public affairs (520), science technologies (530), vocational training (570), construction trades (600-610), consumer services (620-630), mechanics and repairers (640-644), precision production (660-670), transportation (680-690), and "other" (900))

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable A12A in order to identify the general program area of a respondent's principal field of teaching. The categories match NSOPF-88 program area categories.

X02A12

Program area: Teaching categories (detailed classification)

CODE:

1=Agriculture and home economics (Q12=100-110, 350)
2=Business (Q12=160-170)
3=Communications (Q12=180-190)
4=Teacher education (Q12=240-250; includes teacher education-unspecified (240), pre-elementary (241), elementary (242), secondary (243), adult and continuing (244), other general teacher ed. programs (245) and teacher education in specific subjects (250))
5=Other education (Q12=220-230) general education (221), basic skills (222), bilingual and cross-cultural education (223), curriculum and instruction (224), education administration (225), education evaluation and research (226), educational psychology (227), special ed. (228), student counseling and personnel services (229) other education (230))
6=Engineering (Q12=260-280)
7=Fine arts (Q12=140-150)
8=First-professional health sciences (from Q12, includes dentistry (332), medicine (334), pharmacy (336), and veterinary medicine (338))
9=Nursing (Q12=335)
10=Other health sciences (from Q12, includes health sciences-unspecified (330), allied health technologies (331), health services administration (333), public health (337), and other health sciences (340))
11=English and literature (Q12=290-300)
12=Foreign languages (Q12=310-320)
13=History (Q12=548)
14=Philosophy and religion (Q12=480)
15=Law (Q12=370)
16=Biological sciences (Q12=390-400)
17=Physical sciences (Q12=410-420)
18=Mathematics (from Q12, includes mathematics (430) and statistics (440))
19=Computer sciences (Q12=200-210)
20=Economics (Q12=546)
21=Political science (Q12=550)
22=Psychology (Q12=510
23=Sociology (Q12=551)
24=Other social sciences (from Q12, includes social sciences-unspecified (540), general social sciences (541), anthropology (542), archeology (543), area and ethnic studies (544), demography (545), economics (546), geography (547), international relations (549), political science (550), sociology (551), and other social sciences (560))
25=Occupationally specific programs (from Q12, includes vocational training (570, 600-690), parks & recreation (470), protective services (500), and science technologies (530))
26=All other programs (from Q12, includes architecture (120-130), industrial arts (360), library and archival sciences (380), military studies (450), multi/interdisciplinary studies (460), theology (490), public affairs (520), and "other" (900))

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable A12A to identify the specific program area of a respondent's principal field of teaching, in more detail than in 1988.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

X03A12

Program area: Teaching or research (if no teaching area), detailed classification

CODE:
1=Agriculture and home economics (Q12 or Q13=100-110, 350)
2=Business (Q12 or Q13=160-170; includes business (160), accounting (161), banking and finance (162), business administration and finance (163), business administrative report (164), human resources development (165), organizational behavior (166), marketing and distribution (167) and other business (170))
3=Communications (Q12 or Q13=180-190)
4=Teacher education (Q12 or Q13=240-250; includes teacher education (240), pre-elementary (241), elementary (242), secondary (243), adult and continuing (244), other general teacher ed programs (245) and teacher education in specific subjects (250))
5=Other education (Q12 or Q13=220-230) general education (221), basic skills (222), bilingual and cross-cultural education (223), education administration (225), educational psychology (227), other education (230))
6=Engineering (Q12 or Q13=260-280)
7=Fine arts (Q12 or Q13=140-150)
8=First-professional health sciences (from Q12 or Q13, includes dentistry (332), medicine (334), pharmacy (336), and veterinary medicine (338))\
9=Nursing (Q12 or Q13=335)
10=Other health sciences (from Q12 or Q13, includes health sciences-unspecified (330), allied health technologies (331), health services administration (333), public health (337), and other health sciences (340))
11=English and literature (Q12 or Q13=290-300)
12=Foreign languages (Q12 or Q13=310-320)
13=History (Q12 or Q13=548)
14=Philosophy and religion (Q12 or Q13=480)
15=Law (Q12 or Q13=370)
16=Biological sciences (Q12 or Q13=390-400)
17=Physical sciences (Q12 or Q13=410-420)
18=Mathematics (from Q12 or Q13, includes mathematics (430) and statistics (440))
19=Computer sciences (Q12 or Q13=200-210)
20=Economics (Q12 or Q13=546)
21=Political science (Q12 or Q13=550)
22=Psychology (Q12 or Q13=510)
23=Sociology (Q12 or Q13=551)
24=Other social sciences (from Q12 or Q13, includes social sciences-unspecified (540), general social sciences (541), anthropology (542), archeology (543), area and ethnic studies (544), demography (545), economics (546), geography (547), history (548), international relations (549), political science (550), sociology (551), and other social sciences (560))
25=Occupationally specific programs (from Q12 or Q13, includes vocational training (570, 600-690), parks & recreation (470), protective services (500), and science technologies (530))
26=All other programs (from Q12 or Q13, includes architecture (120-130), industrial arts (360), library and archival sciences (380), military studies (450), multi/interdisciplinary studies (460), theology (490), public affairs (520), and "other" (900))

Description of the Derived Variable:
X03A12 is the classification of a respondent's answer for principal field or discipline of teaching at *X02A12* into a specific program area. If the respondent had no principal teaching field, then *X03A12* uses the classification of the respondent's principal research area at *X02A13* into a specific program area.

X01A13
Program area: Research categories (matches NSOPF-88 categories)

CODE:

1=Agriculture and home economics (Q13=100-110, 350; includes agribusiness (101), agricultural sciences (102), renewable resources (103), other agriculture (110), and home economics (350))

2=Business (Q13=160-170; includes accounting (161), banking and finance (162), business administration and finance (163), business administrative report (164), human resources development (165), organizational behavior (166), marketing and distribution (167) and other business (170))

3=Education (Q13=220-250; includes basic skills (222),bilingual and cross-cultural education (223), education administration (225), educational psychology (227), other education (230), teacher education (240), pre-elementary (241), elementary (242), secondary (243), adult and continuing (244), other general teacher ed. programs (245) and teacher education in specific subjects (250))

4=Engineering (Q13=260-280; includes general, civil, mechanical, chemical and other engineering (261-270), engineering-related technologies (280))

5=Fine arts (Q13=140-150, includes art history and appreciation (141), crafts (142), dance (143), design (144), dramatic arts (145), film arts (146), fine arts (147), music (148), music history and appreciation (149), and other visual or performing arts (150))

6=Health sciences (Q13=330-340; includes health sciences-unspecified (330), allied health technologies (331), dentistry (332), health services administration (333), medicine (334), nursing (335), pharmacy (336), public health (337), veterinary medicine (338), and other health sciences (340))

7=Humanities (Q13=290-320, 480, 548; includes general English (291), composition (292), American lit. (293), English lit. (294), linguistics (295), speech (296), English as second language (297), other English (300), foreign languages-unspecified (310), Chinese (311), French (312), German (313), Italian (314), Latin (315), Japanese (316), other Asian (317), Russian (318), Spanish (319), other foreign languages (320), philosophy and religion (480), and history (548))

8=Natural sciences (Q13=200-210, 390-440; includes computer science (200), computer and information sciences (201), computer programming (202), data processing (203), systems analysis (204), other computer science (210), biological sciences-unspecified (390), biochemistry (391), biology (392), botany (393), genetics (394), immunology (395), microbiology (396), physiology (397), zoology (398), other biological sciences (400), physical sciences (410), astronomy (411), chemistry (412), physics (413), geological sciences (414), other physical sciences (420), mathematics (430), and statistics (440))

9=Social sciences (Q13=510, 540-547, 549-560; includes psychology (510), social sciences and history (540), general social sciences (541), anthropology (542), archeology (543), area and ethnic studies (544), demography (545), economics (546), geography (547), history (548), international relations (549), political science (550), sociology (551), and other social sciences (560))
10=All other fields (Q13=120-130, 180-190, 360, 370, 380, 450, 460, 470, 490, 500, 520, 530, 570-900; includes architecture (120-130), communications (180-190), industrial arts (360), law (370), library and archival sciences (380), military studies (450), multi-interdisciplinary studies (460), parks and recreation (470), theology (490), protective services (500), public affairs (520), science technologies (530), vocational training (570), construction trades (600-610), consumer services (620-630), mechanics and repairers (640-644), precision production (660-670), transportation (680-690), and "other" (900))

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from SAS variable A13A in order to identify the general program area of a respondent's principal field of research. The categories match NSOPF-88 program area categories.

X02A13
Program area: Research categories (detailed classification)
CODE:
1=Agriculture and home economics (Q13=100-110, 350)
2=Business (Q13=160-170; includes business (160), accounting (161), banking and finance (162), business administration and finance (163), business administrative report (164), human resources development (165), organizational behavior (166), marketing and distribution (167) and other business (170))
3=Communications (Q12=180-190)
4=Teacher education (Q12=240-250; includes teacher education (240), pre-elementary (241), elementary (242), secondary (243), adult and continuing (244), other general teacher ed. programs (245) and teacher education in specific subjects (250))
5=Other education (Q12=220-230) general education (221), basic skills (222), bilingual and cross-cultural education (223), education administration (225), educational psychology (227), other education (230))
6=Engineering (Q13=260-280)
7=Fine arts (Q13=140-150)
8=First-professional health sciences (from Q13, includes dentistry (332), medicine (334), pharmacy (336), and veterinary medicine (338))
9=Nursing (Q13=335)
10=Other health sciences (from Q13, includes health sciences-unspecified (330), allied health technologies (331), health services administration (333), public health (337), and other health sciences (340))
11=English and literature (Q13=290-300)
12=Foreign languages (Q13=310-320)
13=History (Q13=548)
14=Philosophy and religion (Q13=480)
15=Law (Q13=370)
16=Biological sciences (Q13=390-400)
17=Physical sciences (Q13=410-420)
18=Mathematics (from Q13, includes mathematics (430) and statistics (440))

19=Computer sciences (Q13=200-210)
20=Economics (Q13=546)
21=Political sciences (Q13=550)
22=Psychology (Q13=510)
23=Sociology (Q13=551)
24=Other social sciences (from Q12, includes social sciences and history (540), general social sciences (541), anthropology (542), archeology (543), area and ethnic studies (544), demography (545), economics (546), geography (547), history (548), international relations (549), political science (550), sociology (551), and other social sciences (560))
25=Occupationally specific programs (from Q13, includes vocational training (570, 600-690), parks & recreation (470), protective services (500), and science technologies (530))
26=All other programs (from Q13, includes architecture (120-130), industrial arts (360), library and archival sciences (380), military studies (450), multi/interdisciplinary studies (460), theology (490), public affairs (520), and "other" (900))

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from SAS variable A13A to identify the specific program area of a respondent's principal field of research, in more detail than in 1988.

X01B14
Awards: Undergraduate awards
CODE:
1=Yes (Q14=1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5)
2=No (Q14=6)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to collapse the five categories for academic honors received by a respondent (SAS variables B14_1 to B14_5) into one category in order to indicate whether the respondent reported receiving any academic honors.

The variables B14_1 to B14_5 are as follows:

B14_1=National academic honor society, such as Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Beta Pi, or other field-specific national honor
B14_2=Cum laude or honors
B14_3=Magna cum laude or high honors
B14_4=Summa cum laude or highest honors
B14_5=Other undergraduate academic achievement award

X01B16

Degree: Highest degree

CODE:

1=Ph.D. (Q16A1=2)
2=First-professional (Q16A1=1)
3=Master's (Q16A1=3)
4=Bachelor's (Q16A1=4)
5=Less than bachelor's (Q16A1=5 or 6 or 7)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created in order to describe the highest degree or award achieved by a respondent. If a respondent reported both a Ph.D. and a first professional degree, *X01B16* was coded as "1", (Ph.D.) SAS variable B16A1 (code for type of degree) was used in the creation of this variable.

The values for B16A1 are as follows:

1=Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., L.L.B., etc.)
2=Doctoral degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.)
3=Master's degree or equivalent
4=Bachelor's degree or equivalent
5=Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of more than two years but less than four years in length
6=Associate's degree or equivalent
7=Certificate, diploma, or degree for completion of undergraduate program of at least 1 year but less than two years in length

X02B16

Degree: Highest degree year

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the year in which a respondent received their highest degree, based on SAS variable B16B1 (year highest degree received).

X03B16

Degree: Highest degree program area (matches NSOPF-88 categories)

CODE:

1=Agriculture and home economics (B16C1=100-110, 350; includes agribusiness (101), agricultural sciences (102), renewable resources (103), other agriculture (110), and home economics (350))

2=Business (B16C1=160-170; includes accounting (161), banking and finance (162), business administration and finance (163), business administrative report (164), human resources development (165), organizational behavior (166), marketing and distribution (167) and other business (170))

3=Education (B16C1=220-250; includes basic skills (222), bilingual and cross-cultural education (223), education administration (225), educational psychology (227), other education (230), teacher education (240), pre-elementary (241), elementary (242), secondary (243), adult and continuing (244), other general teacher ed. programs (245) and teacher education in specific subjects (250))

4=Engineering (B16C1=260-280; includes general, civil, mechanical, chemical and other engineering (261-270), engineering-related technologies (280))

5=Fine arts (B16C1=140-150, includes art history and appreciation (141), crafts (142), dance (143), design (144), dramatic arts (145), film arts (146), fine arts (147), music (148), music history and appreciation (149), and other visual or performing arts (150))

6=Health sciences (B16C1=330-340; includes health sciences-unspecified (330), allied health technologies (331), dentistry (332), health services administration (333), medicine (334), nursing (335), pharmacy (336), public health (337), veterinary medicine (338), and other health sciences (340))

7=Humanities (B16C1=290-320, 480, 548; includes general English (291), composition (292), American lit. (293), English lit. (294), linguistics (295), speech (296), English as second language (297), other English (300), foreign languages (310), Chinese (311), French (312), German (313), Italian (314), Latin (315), Japanese (316), other Asian (317), Russian (318), Spanish (319), other foreign languages (320), philosophy and religion (480), and history (548))

8=Natural sciences (B16C1=200-210, 390-440; includes computer science (200), computer and information sciences (201), computer programming (202), data processing (203), systems analysis (204), other computer science (210), biological sciences (390), biochemistry (391), biology (392), botany (393), genetics (394), immunology (395), microbiology (396), physiology (397), zoology (398), other biological sciences (400), physical sciences (410), astronomy (411), chemistry (412), physics (413), geological sciences (414), other physical sciences (420), mathematics (430), and statistics (440))

9=Social sciences (B16C1=510, 540-547, 549-560; includes psychology (510), social sciences and history (540), general social sciences (541), anthropology (542), archeology (543), area and ethnic studies (544), demography (545), economics (546), geography (547), history (548), international relations (549), political science (550), sociology (551), and other social sciences (560))

10=All other fields (B16C1=120-130, 180-190, 360, 370, 380, 450, 460, 470, 490, 500, 520, 530, 570-900; includes architecture (120-130), communications (180-190), industrial arts (360), law (370), library and archival sciences (380), military studies (450), multi-interdisciplinary studies (460), parks and recreation (470), theology (490), protective services (500), public affairs (520), science technologies (530), vocational training (570), construction trades (600-610), consumer services (620-630), mechanics and repairers (640-644), precision production (660-670), transportation (680-690), and "other" (900))

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from SAS variable B16C1 in order to identify the general program area of a respondent's highest degree field. The categories match NSOPF-88 program area categories.

X07B16
Degree: Highest degree program area (more detailed classification)
CODE:
1=Agriculture and home economics (B16C1=100-110, 350)
2=Business (B16C1=160-170; includes business (160), accounting (161), banking and finance (162), business administration and finance (163), business administrative report (164), human resources development (165), organizational behavior (166), marketing and distribution (167) and other business (170))
3=Communications (B16C1=180-190)
4=Teacher education (B16C1=240-250; includes teacher education (240), pre-elementary (241), elementary (242), secondary (243), adult and continuing (244), other general teacher ed. programs (245) and teacher education in specific subjects (250))
5=Other education (Q12=220-230) general education (221), basic skills (222), bilingual and cross-cultural education (223), education administration (225), educational psychology (227), other education (230))
6=Engineering (B16C1=260-280)
7=Fine arts (B16C1=140-150)
8=First-professional health sciences (from B16C1, includes dentistry (332), medicine (334), pharmacy (336), and veterinary medicine (338))
9=Nursing (B16C1=335)
10=Other health sciences (from B16C1, includes health sciences-unspecified (330), allied health technologies (331), health services administration (333), public health (337), and other health sciences (340))
11=English and literature (B16C1=291-300)
12=Foreign languages (B16C1=310-320)
13=History (B16C1=548)
14=Philosophy (B16C1=480)
15=Law (B16C1=370)
16=Biological sciences (B16C1=390-400)
17=Physical sciences (B16C1=410-420)
18=Mathematics (from B16C1, includes mathematics (430) and statistics (440))
19=Computer sciences (B16C1=200-210)
20=Economics (B16C1=546)
21=Political science (B16C1=550)
22=Psychology (B16C1=510)
23=Sociology (B16C1=551)
24=Other social sciences (from B16C1, includes categories 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 547, 549, and 560)
25=Occupationally specific programs (from B16C1, includes vocational training (570, 600-690), parks & recreation (470), protective services (500), and science technologies (530))

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from SAS variable B16C1 in order to identify the specific program area of a respondent's highest degree field, in more detail than in 1988.

X06B16

Employment: Position at institution Fall 1992 first or only job since highest degree attained

CODE:
1=Yes
2=No

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report whether a respondent's current position is the only position held since attaining the highest degree. This variable was created using SAS variables B16B1 (year highest or only degree received), B17A (number of different jobs during Fall 1992), B18A (main other current job), and SAS variables B19A1A and B19A1B (years most recent job was held).

X01B18

Employment: Employment sector of main other Fall 1992 job

CODE:
1=Postsecondary institution (Q18=1 or 2)
2=Hospital, foundation or government (Q18=5, 6 or 8)
3=Consulting or self-Employed (Q18=4)
4=For profit business (Q18=7)
5=Other (Q18=3 or 9)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to indicate the employment sector of the main other job held by a respondent during the 1992 Fall term (SAS variable B18). Postsecondary institutions (two-year or four-year) are collapsed into code 1; hospitals, foundations or government employment are collapsed into Code 2; and elementary or secondary institution is included in Code 5 (Other).

The codes for SAS variable B18 are as follows:

1=Four-year college or university, graduate or professional school
2=Two-year or other postsecondary institution
3=Elementary or secondary school
4=Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice
5=Hospital or other health care or clinical setting
6=Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization
7=For-profit business or industry in the private sector
8=Federal government, including military, or state or local government
9=Other

X02B18

Employment: Primary responsibility of main other Fall 1992 job

CODE:
1=Teaching (Q18B=1)
2=Research (Q18B=2)
3=Other (Q18B NE 1 or 2)

Description of the Derived Variable:

Primary responsibilities reported at SAS variable B18B other than teaching or research are collapsed to create this derived variable.

Codes 3-7 for SAS variable B18B are as follows:

3=Technical activities
4=Clinical service
5=Community/public service
6=Administration
7=Other

X01B19

Employment: Employment sector of most recent main job ending before Fall 1992

CODE:
1=Postsecondary institution (Q19A2=1 or 2)
2=Hospital, foundation or government (Q19A2=5, 6 or 8)
3=Consulting or self-employed (Q19A2=4)
4=For profit business (Q19A2=7)
5=Other (Q19A2=3 or 9)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to indicate the employment sector of the most recent job held by a respondent prior to Fall 1992 (SAS variable B19A2). Postsecondary institutions (two-year or four-year) are collapsed into code 1; hospitals, foundations or government employment are collapsed into Code 2; and elementary or secondary institution is included in Code 5 (other).

The codes for SAS variable B19A2 are as follows:

1=Four-year college or university, graduate or professional school
2=2-year or other postsecondary institution
3=Elementary or secondary school
4=Consulting, freelance work, self-owned business, or private practice
5=Hospital or other health care or clinical setting
6=Foundation or other nonprofit organization other than health care organization
7=For-profit business or industry in the private sector
8=Federal government, including military, or state or local government
9=Other

X02B19

Employment: Primary responsibility of most recent main job

CODE:
1=Teaching (Q19A3=1)
2=Research (Q19A3=2)
3=Other (Q19A3 NE 1 or 2)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to indicate whether the primary responsibility of a respondent was teaching, research or another activity using SAS variable B19A3. Codes for technical activities, clinical service, community/public service, and administration have been collapsed into the "other" code.

Codes 3-7 for SAS variable B19A3 are as follows:

3=Technical activities
4=Clinical service
5=Community/public service
6=Administration
7=Other

X01B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for refereed articles (Q20A1)

CODE:
(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity over the course of their career. This variable is based on SAS variable:

B20A1=Total number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals during career

X02B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for books, chapters (Q20A6+A7+A8+A9)

CODE:
(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity over the course of their career. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20A6=Total number of chapters in edited volumes during career
B20A7=Total number of textbooks during career
B20A8=Total number of other books during career
B20A9=Total number of monographs during career

X03B20
Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for book reviews (Q20A5)
CODE:
(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity over the course of their career. This variable is based on SAS variable:

B20A5=Total number of published reviews of books, articles, or creative works during career

X04B20
Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for other reports (Q20A2+A10)
CODE:
(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity over the course of their career. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20A2=Total number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals during career
B20A10=Total number of research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients during career

X05B20
Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for presentations, exhibitions Q20A11+A12)
CODE:
(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity over the course of their career. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20A11=Total number of presentations at conferences, workshops, etc. during career
B20A12=Total number of exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts during career

X06B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for number of publications (total of Q20A1 through A10)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on most aspects of a respondent's non-teaching productivity over the course of their career. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20A1=Total number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals during career
B20A2=Total number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals during career
B20A3=Total number of creative works published in juried media during career
B20A4=Total number of creative works published in non-juried media or in-house newsletters during career
B20A5=Total number of published reviews of books, articles, or creative works during career
B20A6=Total number of chapters in edited volumes during career
B20A7=Total number of textbooks during career
B20A8=Total number of other books during career
B20A9=Total number of monographs during career
B20A10=Total number of research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients during career

X07B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for number of years for total career refereed articles (1993 minus Q16B1)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the number of years of career output of a respondent's non-teaching productivity (publications, presentations, exhibitions, etc.) since achieving their highest degree.

X08B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Output past two years for refereed articles (Q20B1)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity during the past two years. This variable is based on SAS variable:

B20B1=Number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals during past two years

X09B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Output past two years for books, chapters (Q20B6+B7+B8+B9)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity during the past two years. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20B6=Number of chapters in edited volumes during past two years
B20B7=Number of textbooks during past two years
B20B8=Number of other books during past two years
B20B9=Number of monographs during past two years

X10B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Output past two years for book reviews (Q20B5)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity during the past two years. This variable is based on SAS variable:

B20B5=Number of published reviews of books, articles, or creative works during past two years

X11B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Output past two years for other reports (Q20B2+B10)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity during the past two years. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20B2=Number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals during past two years
B20B10=Number of research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients during past two years

X12B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Output past two years for presentations, exhibitions (Q20B11+B12)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on one aspect of a faculty respondent's non-teaching productivity during the past two years. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20B11=Number of presentations at conferences, workshops, etc. during past two years
B20B12=Number of exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts during past two years

X13B20

Productivity, non-teaching: Output past two years for number of publications (total of Q20B1 through B10)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report on most aspects of a respondent's non-teaching productivity during the past two years. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B20B1=Number of articles published in refereed professional or trade journals during past two years
B20B2=Number of articles published in non-refereed professional or trade journals during past two years
B20B3=Number of creative works published in juried media during past two years
B20B4=Number of creative works published in non-juried media or in-house newsletters during past two years
B20B5=Number of published reviews of books, articles, or creative works during past two years
B20B6=Number of chapters in edited volumes during past two years
B20B7=Number of textbooks during past two years
B20B8=Number of other books during past two years
B20B9=Number of monographs during past two years
B20B10=Number of research or technical reports disseminated internally or to clients during past two years

X01C21

Productivity, non-teaching: Number of undergraduate committees served on (Total Q21A1, A2 and A3)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's non-teaching productivity based on undergraduate committees served on during the 1992 Fall Term. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B21A1=Number of undergraduate thesis or dissertation committees served on
B21A2=Number of undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) served on
B21A3=Number of undergraduate examination/certification committees served on

X02C21

Productivity, non-teaching: Number of graduate committees served on (Total Q21A4, A5 and A6)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's non-teaching productivity based on graduate committees served on during the 1992 Fall Term. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B21A4=Number of graduate thesis or dissertation committees served on

B21A5=Number of graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) served on

B21A6=Number of graduate examination/certification committees served on

X03C21

Productivity, non-teaching: Total committees served on (Total Q21A)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's non-teaching productivity based on total committees served on during the 1992 Fall Term. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

B21A1=Number of undergraduate thesis or dissertation committees served on

B21A2=Number of undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) served on

B21A3=Number of undergraduate examination/certification committees served on

B21A4=Number of graduate thesis or dissertation committees served on

B21A5=Number of graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) served on

B21A6=Number of graduate examination/certification committees served on

X04C21

Productivity, non-teaching: Number of undergraduate committees chaired (Total Q21B1, B2 and B3)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's non-teaching productivity based on undergraduate committees chaired during the 1992 Fall Term. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

C21B1=Number of undergraduate thesis or dissertation committees chaired

C21B2=Number of undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) chaired

C21B3=Number of undergraduate examination/certification committees chaired

X05C21

Productivity, non-teaching: Number of graduate committees chaired (Total Q21B4, B5 and B6)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's non-teaching productivity based on graduate committees chaired during the 1992 Fall Term. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

C21B4=Number of graduate thesis or dissertation committees chaired
C21B5=Number of graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) chaired
C21B6=Number of graduate examination/certification committees chaired

X06C21

Productivity, non-teaching: Total committees chaired (Total Q21B)

CODE:

(Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's non-teaching productivity based on total committees chaired during the 1992 Fall Term. This variable is based on totals reported at SAS variables:

C21B1=Number of undergraduate thesis or dissertation committees chaired
C21B2=Number of undergraduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) chaired
C21B3=Number of undergraduate examination/certification committees chaired
C21B4=Number of graduate thesis or dissertation committees chaired
C21B5=Number of graduate comprehensive exams or orals committees (other than as part of thesis/dissertation committees) chaired
C21B6=Number of graduate examination/certification committees chaired

X01C23

Productivity, teaching: Total hours spent teaching per week in 5 or fewer classes for credit (Q23A2G + B2G + C2G + D2G + E2G, or C, if G was imputed and C was not imputed)

CODE:

(TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the total number of hours spent teaching per week at five or fewer classes for credit, by adding together the hours spent teaching for each reported class at SAS variables C23A2G through C23E2G (unless these values were imputed and C23A2C through C23E2C was not, in which case C23A2C through C23E2C were used). A maximum of five classes could be reported.

X02C23

Productivity, teaching: Total classroom student contact hours per week in five or fewer classes for credit [total sum of (A2E × A2G or C, if G was imputed and C was not imputed]

CODE:

(TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the total student contact hours per week with students in five or fewer classes for credit. For each class taught, the average number of hours per week the respondent taught the class (SAS variables C23A2G through C23E2G, unless these values were imputed and C23A2C through C23E2C were not, in which case C23A2C through C23E2C were used) is multiplied by the number of students enrolled in the class (C23A2E through C23E2E); the results are added together to obtain the total student contact hours in five or fewer classes for credit.

X03C23

Productivity, teaching: Total classroom credit hours in five or fewer classes
(Q23A2B + B2B + C2B + D2B + E2B)

CODE:

(TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the total number of classroom credit hours reported by adding together the number of credit hours for each class provided in SAS variables C23A2B through C23E2B. A maximum of five classes could be reported.

X04C23

Productivity, teaching: Total classroom individual credit hours in five or fewer classes [total sum of (A2B × A2E)]

CODE:

(TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the total student credit hours taught in the classes reported. For each class taught, the number of credit hours (SAS variables C23A2B through C23E2B) is multiplied by the number of students enrolled (SAS variables C23A2E through C23E2E); the results are added together to obtain the total student credit hours taught in the classes reported. A maximum of five classes could be reported.

X05C23

Productivity, teaching: Level of classroom instruction

CODE:

1=Taught only undergraduate courses (Q23A3 and Q23B3 and Q23C3 and Q23D3 and Q23E3 NE 3)

2=Taught both undergraduate and graduate courses (at least one of Q23A3 or Q23B3 or Q23C3 or Q23D3 or Q23E3=3 and at least one of them=1, 2, or 4)

3=Taught only graduate courses (Q23A3 and Q23B3 and Q23C3 and Q23D3 and Q23E3=3)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's level of classroom credit instruction. SAS variables C23A3 through C23E3 used in the creation of this variable deal with the primary level of students (in up to five courses taught for credit). Lower or upper division students as well as the category "all other students", are considered undergraduates. Graduate or any other post-baccalaureate students are considered graduate level students. If a respondent taught classes to primarily undergraduate level students and some to graduate level students then the classroom instruction was categorized as both. The codes used at SAS variables C23A3 through C23E3 are as follows:

1=Lower division students
2=Upper division students
3=Graduate or other post-baccalaureate students
4=All other students.

X08C23

Productivity, teaching: Number of undergraduate classes taught for credit (five or fewer) (Q23A3 NE 3 + B3 NE 3 + C3 NE 3 + D3 NE 3 + E3 NE 3)

CODE:

(TOTAL CLASSES, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the total number of undergraduate classes taught for credit, by excluding those classes where the primary level of students is graduate or any other post-baccalaureate-level (code 3 at SAS variables C23A3 through C23E3), and adding together those classes where the primary level of students is under-graduate level. (Student levels are defined at *X05C23*.) The codes used to create this derived variable are as follows (from SAS variables C23A3 through C23E3):

1=Lower division students
2=Upper division students
4=All other students.
A maximum of five classes could be reported.

X09C23
Productivity, teaching: Number of graduate classes taught for credit (5 or fewer)
(Q23A3=3 + B3=3 + C3=3 + D3=3 + E3=3)
CODE:
(TOTAL CLASSES, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the total number of graduate classes taught for credit, by adding together those classes where the primary level of students is graduate-level (SAS variable C23A3 through C23E3 = 3). A maximum of five classes could be reported.

X14C23
Productivity, teaching: Number of students taught in 5 or fewer classes for credit
(Q23A2E+B2E+C2E+D2E+E2E)
CODE:
(TOTAL STUDENTS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the total number of students taught for credit, by adding together the number of students reported for each class. (SAS variables C23A2E through C23E2E). A maximum of five classes could be reported.

X19C23
Productivity, teaching: Average number teaching assistants per class in five or fewer classes for credit (total number of teaching assistants divided by total number of classes)
CODE:
(AVERAGE NUMBER, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the average number of teaching assistants and readers by adding together the number of teaching assistants and readers reported by a faculty respondent for each class (SAS variables C23A2D through C23E2D) and dividing by the total number of classes. A maximum of five classes could be reported.

X01C25

Productivity, teaching: Level of individualized instruction

CODE:

1=Taught only undergraduate students (Q25A3=0 and Q25A1 or Q25A2 or Q25A4 GT 0)
2=Taught both undergraduate and graduate students (Q25A3 GT 0 and Q25A1, Q25A2 or Q25A4 GT 0)
3=Taught only graduate students (Q25A3 GT 0 and Q25A1, Q25A2 and Q25A4=0)
4=None (Q25A1 through Q25A4=0)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's teaching productivity in terms of their level of individualized instruction. (See *X05C23* for definitions of student levels.) SAS variables C25A1 through C25A4, used in the creation of this derived variable, deal with the level of students who received formal individualized instruction, with codes as follows:

1=Lower division students
2=Upper division students
3=Graduate or other post-baccalaureate students
4=All other students.

X04C25

Productivity, teaching: Total number of undergraduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit (Q25A1+A2+A4)

CODE:

(TOTAL STUDENTS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the total number of undergraduate students receiving individualized instruction, based on SAS variables C25A1, A2 and A4 which report only about undergraduate students. (Lower or upper division students, as well as those categorized as "all other students," are considered undergraduates.)

X05C25

Productivity, teaching: Total number of graduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit (Q25A3)

CODE:

(TOTAL STUDENTS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the total number of graduate students receiving individualized instruction as reported at SAS variable C25A3.

X06C25

Productivity, teaching: Total students receiving individualized instruction for credit (total Q25A)

CODE:

(TOTAL STUDENTS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variables C25A1 through C25A4 to report the total number of students (undergraduate, graduate and all other students) receiving individualized instruction for credit.

X07C25

Productivity, teaching: Total contact hours per week for undergraduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit (Q25B1+B2+B4)

CODE:

(TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the total number of contact hours spent providing individualized instruction to undergraduate students. Lower or upper division students as well as those categorized as "all other students" are considered undergraduates. This variable was created from SAS variables C25B1, C25B2 and C25B4.

X08C25

Productivity, teaching: Total contact hours per week for graduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit (Q25B3)

CODE:

(TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable C25B3 to report the total number of contact hours spent providing individualized instruction to graduate students.

X09C25

Productivity, teaching: Total contact hours per week of individualized instruction for credit (Q25B)

CODE:

(TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variables C25B1 through C25B4 to report the total number of contact hours spent providing individualized instruction to students, regardless of level.

X02C33

Productivity, non-teaching: Total funds (Q33D1 + D2 + D3 + D4 + D5 + D6)
CODE:
(TOTAL FUNDS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable is created by totaling SAS variables C33D1 through C33D6, which report the total research or grant funds received for the 1992-93 academic year from each of 6 sources:

C33D1=Sampled institution
C33D2=Foundation or other nonprofit organization
C33D3=For profit business or industry in the private sector
C33D4=State or local government
C33D5=Federal government
C33D6=Other source

X03C33

Productivity, non-teaching: Average award (total funds divided by total grants/contracts)
CODE:
(AVERAGE AWARD, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by dividing the total of SAS variables C33D1 through C33D6 (described at derived variable *X02C33*) by the total number of grants/contracts reported at SAS variables C33B1 through C33B6.

X01C34

Academic environment: Overall quality of facilities or resources (index)

CODE:
1=Very poor
2=Poor
3=Good
4=Very good

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created by averaging the responses by a faculty respondent at SAS variables C34A through C34L which are concerned with the quality of various types of facilities and resources. The categories are as follows:

C34A=Basic research equipment/instruments
C34B=Laboratory space and supplies
C34C=Availability of research assistants
C34D=Personal computers
C34E=Centralized (main frame) computer facilities
C34F=Computer networks with other institutions
C34G=Audio-visual equipment
C34H=Classroom space
C34I=Office space
C34J=Studio/performance space
C34K=Secretarial support
C34L=Library holdings

X01C35

Academic environment: Adequacy of internal funds for professional development (index)
CODE:
1=Adequate (all 35C=1)
2=Somewhat adequate (more 35C=1 than 35C=2 or, if # of 2's=# of 1's)
3=Somewhat inadequate (more 35C=2 than 35C=1)
4=Inadequate (all 35C=2)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variables C35C1 through C35C6; two codes (1=Yes and 2= No) were recoded (based on the total number of 1's and 2's) to indicate whether available funding was adequate for each of six categories:

C35C1=Tuition remission at this or other institutions
C35C2=Professional association memberships and/or registration fees
C35C3=Professional travel
C35C4=Training to improve research or teaching skills
C35C5=Retraining for fields in higher demand
C35C6=Sabbatical leave

If "yes" (adequate) was coded for all six categories, *X01C35* was coded as "1" (adequate). If equal numbers of categories were coded "yes" and "no," or if more categories were coded "yes" than "no," *X01C35* was coded as "2" (somewhat adequate). If more categories were coded "no" than "yes," *X01C35* was coded as "3" (somewhat inadequate). There were no cases where all six categories were coded "no".

X01C36

Time allocation: Average total hours per week worked (Total Q36)
CODE:
(AVERAGE TOTAL HOURS, Open-ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable is created by totaling SAS variables C36A through C36D, which are concerned with hours spent at the following activities:

C36A=All paid activities at this institution
C36B=All unpaid activities at this institution
C36C=Any other paid activities outside this institution (e.g., consulting, working on other jobs)
C36D=Unpaid (pro bono) professional service outside this institution

X01C37

Time allocation: Percentage of time spent teaching (Q37AA)
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, open ended)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the actual percentage of work time respondents spent in teaching during the Fall of 1992, based on SAS variable C37AA.

X02C37

Time allocation: Percentage of time spent in research (Q37AB)

CODE:

(PERCENTAGE, open ended)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the actual percentage of work time respondents spent in research during the Fall of 1992, based on SAS variable C37AAB.

X03C37

Time allocation: Percentage of time spent in administration (Q37AD)

CODE:

(PERCENTAGE, Open Ended)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the actual percentage of work time respondents spent in administration during the Fall of 1992, based on SAS variable C37AD.

X04C37

Time allocation: Percentage of time spent in other activities (Q37AC+ C37AE + C37AF)

CODE:

(PERCENTAGE, Open Ended)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the actual percentage of work time respondents spent in activities other than teaching, research or administration during the Fall of 1992, based on these SAS variables:

C37AC=Professional growth
C37AE=Outside consulting or free-lance work
C37AF=Service/other non-teaching work

X05C37

Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred teaching (Q37BA)

CODE:

(PERCENTAGE, Open Ended) Description of Derived Variable:

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the percentage of work time respondents would have preferred to spend in teaching during the Fall of 1992, based on SAS variable C37BA.

X06C37

Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred in research (Q37BB)

CODE:

(PERCENTAGE, Open Ended)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the percentage of work time respondents would have preferred to spend in research during the Fall of 1992, based on SAS variable C37BB.

X07C37
Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred in administration (Q37BD)
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, Open Ended)

Description of Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to report the percentage of work time respondents would have preferred to spend in administration during the Fall of 1992, based on SAS variable C37BD.

X08C37
Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred in other activities (Q37BC+ C37BE + C37BF)
CODE:
(PERCENTAGE, Open Ended)

Description of Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to report the percentage of work time respondents would have preferred to spend in activities other than teaching, research or administration, during the Fall of 1992, based on these SAS variables:

C37BC=Professional growth
C37BE=Outside consulting or free-lance work
C37BF=Service / other non-teaching work

X01C38
Union member
CODE:
1=Yes (Q38=3)
2=No (Q38-2)
3=Not eligible or union not available (Q38=1 or 4)

Description of Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from SAS variable C38 and provides information about union membership and eligibility. Code 1 (union is available, but respondent is not eligible) and Code 4 (union is not available at sampled institution) have been collapsed into one category.

X01D41
Future: Very likely to retire in the next 3 years
CODE:
1=Yes (Q41E=3)
2=No

Description of Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from SAS variable D41E, in which respondents indicate how likely they are to retire from the labor force during the next 3 years. Code 3 (very likely) was the response category used for this derived variable. Respondents who reported they were very likely to retire were coded "1" at *X01D41*.

X02D41

Future: Very likely to accept part-time job in the next 3 years
CODE:
1=Yes (Q41A=3 or c=3)
2=No

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variables D41A or D41C, in which the respondent indicates how likely they are to accept a part-time job at a different postsecondary institution or accept a part-time job elsewhere during the next 3 years. Code 3 (very likely) was the response category used for this derived variable. Respondents who reported at D41A or D41C they were very likely to accept a part-time job were coded “1" at X02D41.

X03D41

Future: Very likely to accept a full-time job in the next 3 years
CODE:
1=Yes (Q41B=3 or d=3)
2=No

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variables D41B or D41D, in which respondents indicate how likely they are to accept a full-time job at a different postsecondary institution or accept a full-time job elsewhere. Code 3 (very likely) was the response category used for this derived variable. Respondents who reported they were very likely to accept a full-time job were coded "1" at *X03D41*.

X04D41

Future: Very likely to retire or accept a part- or full-time job in the next 3 years
CODE:
1=Yes (Q41A=3 or B=3 or C=3 or D=3 or E=3)
2=No

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variables D41A to D41E, in which the respondent indicates how likely they are to accept a part-or full-time job at a different postsecondary institution or elsewhere, or to retire during the next 3 years. Code 3 (very likely) was the response category used for this derived variable. Respondents who reported they were very likely to accept a full-time or part-time job were coded "1" at *X04D41*.

X05D41

Future: Likely to retire or accept a part- or full-time job in the next 3 years
CODE:
1=Yes (Q41A=2 or 3, or B=2 or 3 or C=2 or 3, or D=2 or 3, or E=2 or 3)
2=No (Q41A=1 and B=1 and C=1 and D=1 and E=1)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variables D41A to D41E, in which the respondent indicates how likely they are to accept a part-or full-time job at a different postsecondary institution or elsewhere, or to retire during the next 3 years. Codes 2 (somewhat likely) or 3 (very likely) were the response categories used for this derived variable. Respondents who reported they were very likely to accept a different job or retire were coded "1" at *X05D41*.

X01D42

Future: Age likely to stop working at a postsecondary institution
CODE:
-2=Don't know
1=Under 55
2=55 to 59
3=60
4=61 to 64
5=65
6=66 to 69
7=70
8=71 and up

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable D42 by recoding the age respondents have indicated as the "most likely" age when they will stop working at any postsecondary institution.

X01D46

Future: Years to retirement (Q46 minus calculated age from Q52)
CODE:
-2=Don't know
0=This year
1=1-5
2=6-10
3=11-15
4=16-25
5=Over 25

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to provide a calculation of the years until a respondent's projected retirement by subtracting the respondent's calculated age (derived from the respondent's year of birth at SAS variable F52B) from the age the respondent has indicated as the "most likely" retirement age (SAS variable D46).

X02D46

Future: Age likely to retire from all paid employment

CODE:

-2=Don't know
1=Under 60
2=60
3=61 to 64
4=65
5=66-69
6=70
7=71 and up

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created from SAS variable D46 by recoding the age respondents have indicated as their "most likely" retirement age.

X01E47

Compensation: Basic salary from institution (Q47A)

CODE:

(ranges)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the amount of basic salary the respondent had during the 1992 calendar year from their sampled institution, based on SAS variable E47A.

X02E47

Compensation: Basic salary annualized (Q47A divided by Q47B (the number of months of appointment) × 12)

CODE:

(ranges)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the annualized amount of respondent's basic salary at their sampled institution during the 1992 faculty calendar year, based on SAS variable E47A divided by the number of months of appointment (E47B) then multiplied by 12 months.

X03E47

Compensation: Other income from institution (Q47C + E47D + E47E + E47F)

CODE:

(ranges)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's total income other than basic salary from their sampled institution during the 1992 calendar year, based on these SAS variables:

E47C=Amount from other teaching at this institution not included in basic salary
E47D=Amount from supplements not included in basic salary
E47E=Amount from non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car
E47F=Amount from any other income from this institution

X04E47

Compensation: Outside consulting income (Q47I)
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the amount of outside consulting income during the 1992 calendar year, based on SAS variable E47I.

X05E47

Compensation: Other outside income (Q47G + Q47H + Q47J + Q47K + Q47L + Q47M +Q47 N + Q47O + Q47P + Q47Q)
CODE:
(ranges)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report a respondent's total income from sources (other than outside consulting) outside their sampled institution for the 1992 calendar year, based on these SAS variables:

E47G=Amount from employment at another academic institution
E47H=Amount from legal or medical services or psychological counseling
E47J=Amount from self-owned business (other than consulting)
E47K=Amount from professional performances or exhibitions
E47L=Amount from speaking fees, honoraria
E48M=Amount from royalties or commissions
E48N=Amount from any other employment
E48O=Amount from non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car
E47P1=Amount from grants/fellowships (federal, state, city, NSF, Fullbright)
E47P2=Amount from retirement, pension, soc. sec., unemployment
E47P3=Amount from military pension/retirement/other military
E47P4=Amount from alimony, child support, spouse income
E47P5=Amount from dividends, annuities, insurance, investments, interest, capital gains
E47P6=Amount from government (local/state/federal)
E47P7=Amount from loans
E47P8=Amount from real estate, rental properties
E47P9=Amount from other sources
(Note: E47P1-E47P9 were recoded from Q47P and Q47Q, which were verbatim responses specifying other sources of earned income.)

X06E47

Compensation: Total earned income (Q47A + Q47C + Q47D + Q47 E + Q47F + Q47G + Q47H + Q47J + Q47K + Q47L + Q47M + Q47 N + Q47O + Q47P + Q47Q)

CODE:
(ranges)

Description of Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the total amount of various sources of compensation the respondent had during the 1992 calendar year, based on these SAS variables:

E47A=Amount from basic salary
E47C=Amount from other teaching at this institution not included in basic salary
E47D=Amount from supplements not included in basic salary
E47E=Amount from non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car
E47F=Amount from any other income from this institution
E47G=Amount from employment at another academic institution
E47H=Amount from legal or medical services or psychological counseling
E47I=Amount from outside consulting, consulting business or freelance work
E47J=Amount from self-owned business (other than consulting)
E47K=Amount from professional performances or exhibitions
E47L=Amount from speaking fees, honoraria
E48M=Amount from royalties or commissions
E48N=Amount from any other employment
E48O=Amount from non-monetary compensation, such as food, housing, car
E47P1=Amount from grants/fellowships (federal, state, city, NSF, Fulbright)
E47P2=Amount from retirement, pension, soc. sec., unemployment
E47P3=Amount from military pension/retirement/other military
E47P4=Amount from alimony, child support, spouse income
E47P5=Amount from dividends, annuities, insurance, investments, interest, capital gains
E47P6=Amount from government (local/state/federal)
E47P7=Amount from loans
E47P8=Amount from real estate, rental properties
E47P9=Amount from other sources
(Note: E47P1-E47P9 were recoded from Q47P and Q47Q, which were verbatim responses specifying other sources of earned income.)

X01E49

SES: Average income per household member (Q49 divided by Q48)

CODE:
(AVERAGE INCOME, open ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to report the average income per household member, by dividing the total household income (SAS variable E49) by the total number of persons in a respondent's household (SAS variable E48).

X01F52
Age: (Q52 converted to number of years old in 1993)
CODE:
(AGE, open ended)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to report a respondent's age calculated from SAS variable F52b (year of birth).

X02F52
Age: Distribution (matches NSOPF-88)
CODE:
1=Under 30
2=30-44
3=45-54
4=55-59
5=60-64
6=65 or older

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created in order to distribute the *X01F52* age to match the NSOPF-88 age distribution.

X03F52
Age: Modified distribution
CODE:
1=Under 35
2=35-44
3=45-54
4=55-64
5=65-70
6=71 or older

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to redistribute the *X01F52* age, and separate respondents over age 65 into two categories.

X01F53
Race

CODE:
1=American Indian or Alaskan Native
2=Asian or Pacific Islander
3=African American/Black
4=White

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created using Federal Directive #15 as a guide. Federal Directive #15 provides standard classifications for record keeping, collection, and presentation of data on race and ethnicity in Federal program administrative reporting and statistical activities. It was developed to provide for the collection and use of compatible, non-duplicated, exchangeable racial and ethnic data by Federal agencies. Federal Directive #15 states that when reporting on respondents who are of mixed racial and/or ethnic origins, it is best to use the category which, "...most closely reflects the individual's recognition in his community." If a respondent's answer to SAS variable F53A was 1 (American Indian or Alaskan Native), 2 (Asian or Pacific Islander), 3 African American/Black), or 4 (White), they were coded accordingly at *X01F53*. If the respondent answered F53A, "Other", with the verbatim text in F53B equal to one racial category, then these verbatim responses were coded according to Federal Directive #15. There were a number of cases in which the verbatim responses were automatically coded using programs created for this purpose. Text string matches were created after visual inspection of respondent data. The text matches included in these programs are valid only for this data set and are not prescribed as part of Federal Directive #15.

A macro was written in order to recode the verbatim responses to the "Other" (category '05') in F53A that could not be automatically categorized into one of the four existing racial categories (e.g., if a respondent's verbatim response to F53B was 'Mix White/Black/Indian'). In these cases, assignment of the respondent to a legitimate racial code had to be done manually. We compared each of the verbatim responses with the definitions for each racial category as they appeared in Federal Directive #15 and an alphabetical race and American Indian tribe list supplement. The first identifiable race mentioned was taken. If this race was codable, then the macro transformed the response accordingly.

If a response could still not be coded (e.g., if the verbatim response to F53A was "Human" or "American"), the response remained "Other" '05'. A random digit between 1 and 4 was imputed for each of the remaining respondents using the RANTBL function. RANTBL is a function in SAS used to generate a random number.

RANTBL=1 (American Indian or Alaskan Native) with probability P1
=2 (Asian or Pacific Islander) with probability P2
=3 (African American/Black) with probability P3
=4 (White) with probability P4.

If (F53A=5) then *X01F53*=rantbl(&seed,&P1,&P2,&P3,&P4); the seed for the RANTBL function was set at 6281994 (the date the program was originally written). P1 through P4 are the probabilities of each of the four categories occurring (.01,.05,.09,.85), respectively. These probabilities were calculated from the survey data (P1+P2+P3+P4=1).

X02F53
Race/ethnicity
CODE:
1=American Indian or Alaskan Native
2=Asian or Pacific Islander
3=African American/Black, not of Hispanic origin
4=Hispanic
5=White, not of Hispanic origin

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from derived variable *X01F53* and SAS variable F54. According to Federal Directive #15, if a combined format is used to collect racial and ethnic data, the minimum acceptable categories are:

-American Indian or Alaskan Native
-Asian or Pacific Islander
-African American/Black, not of Hispanic origin
-Hispanic
-White, not of Hispanic origin.

If *X01F53*=1, a respondent was coded as "American Indian or Alaskan Native" for race/ethnicity. If *X01F53*=2, the respondent was coded as "Asian American or Pacific Islander" for race/ethnicity. If *X01F53*=3 and F54=2, the respondent was coded as "Black, not of Hispanic origin" for race/ethnicity. If *X01F53*=4 and F54=2, the respondent was coded as "White, not of Hispanic origin" for race/ethnicity. If *X01F53*=3 or 4 and F54=1, then the respondent was coded as "Hispanic" for race/ethnicity. Prior to the creation of derived variable *X01F53*, if F53a= "Other" '05', with a verbatim that was something other than "Hispanic" (but could be defined as Hispanic, e.g., Cuban), F54 and F54Aa were recoded if appropriate.

X03F53
Citizenship and minority status
CODE:
1=Citizen and non-white (minority)
2=Citizen and white (nonminority)
3=Noncitizen and non-white (minority)
4=Noncitizen and white (nonminority)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from derived variable *X02F53* and SAS variable F57A to separate respondents on the basis of their citizenship and minority status. F57A is 1 (U.S. citizen, native) or 2 (U.S. citizen, naturalized) if the respondent is a citizen of the United States. F57A is 3 (permanent resident of U.S. with an immigrant visa), or 4 (temporary resident of the U.S. with non-immigrant visa) if the respondent is not a citizen of the United States.

X01F55
SES: Family status
CODE:
1=Single without dependents (Q55=1 or 4 or 5 or 6 and Q50=0)
2=Single with dependents (Q55=1 or 4 or 5 or 6 and Q50 GT 0)
3=Married without dependents (Q55=2 or 3 and Q50=0)
4=Married with dependents (Q55=2 or 3 and Q50 GT 0)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable is created by combining SAS variable F55 (current marital status) with SAS variable E50 (number of dependents).

X01F56
Citizenship: Status expanded
CODE:
1=Citizen, born in U.S. (Q56=1, and Q57=1 or 2)
2=Citizen, foreign born (Q56=2 and Q57=1 or 2)
3=Noncitizen (Q57=3 or 4)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created from SAS variables F56 (country of birth coded as either 1=USA or 2=Other) and F57A (citizenship status, described at derived variable *X03F53*).

X02F57
Citizenship: Current (modified NSOPF-88 categories)
CODE:
1=USA
2=Canadian
3=European
4=Latin American (Mexico/Central and South America)
5=African
6=Asian
7=Other (Australia, New Zealand, Philippines, Indonesia)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to recode SAS variable F57C (country of present citizenship), into a modified version of the NSOPF-88 categories.

X03F57
Citizenship: Status
CODE:
1=Citizen (Q57=1 or 2)
2=Non-citizen (Q57=3 or 4)

Description of the Derived Variable:
This derived variable was created to classify respondents as either citizens or non-citizens based on SAS variable F57A, as defined at derived variable *X03F53*.

X01F58

SES: Parents' education (Q58, A+B divided by 2)

CODE:
-2=Don't Know
1=High (more than 6)
2=Medium (6 or less but more than 2)
3=Low (2 or less)

Description of the Derived Variable:

This derived variable was created to classify the parents of faculty respondents according to their level of formal education. Values at SAS variable F58A (mother's formal education) and F58B (father's formal education) were added together, then divided by 2. A resulting value of 1 or 2 was coded as "low" at *X01F58*, a value of 3 through 6 was coded as "medium" at *X01F58*, and a value of 7 or 8 was coded as "high" at X01F58. (If either F58A or F58B was coded "don't know", then the higher coded response is used for the derived variable. If both were "don't know", then the derived variable was coded as "don't know.") The values at F58 are as follows:

-2=Don't know
1=Less than high school diploma
2=High school diploma
3=Some college
4=Associate's degree
5=Bachelor's degree
6=Master's degree
7=Doctorate or professional degree (e.g., Ph.D., M.D., D.V.M., J.D./L.L.B)
8=Other

Exhibit O-1: Discipline Crosswalk, NSOPF 1988-1993

EXHIBIT O-1: DISCIPLINE CROSSWALK, NSOPF 1988-1993 CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1988 CODES	1993 CODES	
	100	AGRICULTURE--UNSPECIFIED
001	101	Agribusiness & Agricultural Production
002	102	Agricultural Animal, Food, & Plant Sciences
003	103	Renewable Natural Resources, including Conservation, Fishing, & Forestry
004	110	Other Agriculture
	120	ARCHITECTURE & ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN--UNSPECIFIED
005	121	Architecture & Environmental Design
006	122	City, Community, & Regional Planning
007	123	Interior Design
008	124	Land Use Management & Reclamation Design
009	130	Other Arch. & Environmental Design
	140	ART--UNSPECIFIED
010	141	Art History & Appreciation
011	142	Crafts
012	143	Dance
013	144	Design (other than Arch. or Interior)
014	145	Dramatic Arts
015	146	Film Arts
016	147	Fine Arts
017	148	Music
018	149	Music History & Appreciation
019	150	Other Visual & Performing Arts
	160	BUSINESS--UNSPECIFIED
020	161	Accounting
021	162	Banking & Finance
022	163	Business Administration & Management

EXHIBIT O-1: DISCIPLINE CROSSWALK, NSOPF 1988-1993
CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1988 CODES	1993 CODES	
		BUSINESS--UNSPECIFIED (CONT'D)
023	164	Business Administrative Support (e.g., Bookkeeping, Office Management, Secretarial)
024	165	Human Resources
025	166	Organizational Behavior
026	167	Marketing & Distribution
027	170	Other Business
	180	COMMUNICATIONS--UNSPECIFIED
028	181	Advertising
029	182	Broadcasting & Journalism
030	183	Communications Research
031	184	Communication Technologies
032	190	Other Communications
	200	COMPUTER SCIENCE--UNSPECIFIED
033	201	Computer & Information Sciences
034	202	Computer Programming
035	203	Data Processing
036	204	Systems Analysis
037	210	Other Computer Science
	220	EDUCATION--UNSPECIFIED
038	221	Education, General
039	222	Basic Skills
040	223	Bilingual/Cross-cultural Education
041	224	Curriculum & Instruction
042	225	Education Administration
043	226	Education Evaluation & Research
044	227	Educational Psychology

EXHIBIT O-1: DISCIPLINE CROSSWALK, NSOPF 1988-1993 CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1988 CODES	1993 CODES	
		EDUCATION--UNSPECIFIED (CONT'D)
045	228	Special Education
046	229	Student Counseling & Personnel Svcs.
047	230	Other Education
	240	TEACHER EDUCATION--UNSPECIFIED
048	241	Pre-Elementary
049	242	Elementary
050	243	Secondary
051	244	Adult & Continuing
052	245	Other General Teacher Ed. Programs
053	250	Teacher Education in Specific Subjects
	260	ENGINEERING--UNSPECIFIED
054	261	Engineering, General
055	262	Civil Engineering
056	263	Electrical, Electronics, & Communication Engineering
057	264	Mechanical Engineering
	265	Chemical Engineering
058	270	Other Engineering
059	280	Engineering-Related Technologies
	290	ENGLISH AND LITERATURE--UNSPECIFIED
060	291	English, General
061	292	Composition & Creative Writing
062	293	American Literature
063	294	English Literature
064	295	Linguistics
065	296	Speech, Debate, & Forensics

EXHIBIT O-1: DISCIPLINE CROSSWALK, NSOPF 1988-1993 CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1988 CODES	1993 CODES	
		ENGLISH AND LITERATURE--UNSPEC (CONT'D)
066	297	English as a Second Language
067	300	English, Other
	310	FOREIGN LANGUAGES--UNSPECIFIED
068	311	Chinese (Mandarin, Cantonese, or Other Chinese)
069	312	French
070	313	German
071	314	Italian
072	315	Latin
073	316	Japanese
074	317	Other Asian
075	318	Russian or Other Slavic
076	319	Spanish
077	320	Other Foreign Languages
	330	HEALTH SCIENCES--UNSPECIFIED
078	331	Allied Health Technologies & Services
079	332	Dentistry
080	333	Health Services Administration
081	334	Medicine, including Psychiatry
082	335	Nursing
083	336	Pharmacy
084	337	Public Health
085	338	Veterinary Medicine
086	340	Other Health Sciences
087	**350**	HOME ECONOMICS
088	**360**	INDUSTRIAL ARTS
089	**370**	LAW

EXHIBIT O-1: DISCIPLINE CROSSWALK, NSOPF 1988-1993 CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1988 CODES	1993 CODES	
090	**380**	LIBRARY & ARCHIVAL SCIENCES
091		LIFE OR PHYSICAL SCIENCES, GENERAL
	390	NATURAL SCIENCES: BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES--UNSPECIFIED
100	391	Biochemistry
093	392	Biology
094	393	Botany
100	394	Genetics
100	395	Immunology
100	396	Microbiology
098	397	Physiology
099	398	Zoology
100	400	Biological Sciences, Other
	410	NATURAL SCIENCES: PHYSICAL SCIENCES--UNSPECIFIED
092	411	Astronomy
095	412	Chemistry
097	413	Physics
096	414	Earth, Atmosphere, and Oceanographic (Geological Sciences)
100	420	Physical Sciences
101	**430**	MATHEMATICS
101	**440**	STATISTICS
102	**450**	MILITARY STUDIES
103	**460**	MULTI/INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
104	**470**	PARKS & RECREATION
105	**480**	PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION
105	**490**	THEOLOGY

EXHIBIT O-1: DISCIPLINE CROSSWALK, NSOPF 1988-1993
CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1988 CODES	1993 CODES	
107	**500**	PROTECTIVE SERVICES (e.g., Criminal Justic, Fire Protection)
106	**510**	PSYCHOLOGY
108	**520**	PUBLIC AFFAIRS (e.g., Community Services, Public Administration, Public Works, Social Work)
109	**530**	SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES
	540	SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY--UNSPECIFIED
110	541	Social Sciences, General
111	542	Anthropology
112	543	Archeology
113	544	Area & Ethnic Studies
114	545	Demography
115	546	Economics
116	547	Geography
117	548	History
118	549	International Relations
119	550	Political Science
120	551	Sociology
121	560	Other Social Sciences
	570	VOCATIONAL TRAINING--UNSPECIFIED
	600	CONSTRUCTION TRADES--UNSPECIFIED
122	601	Carpentry
123	602	Electrician
124	603	Plumbing
125	610	Other Construction Trades
	620	CONSUMER, PERSONAL, & MISC. SERVICES--UNSPECIFIED
126	621	Personal Services (e.g., Barbering, Cosmetology)

EXHIBIT O-1: DISCIPLINE CROSSWALK, NSOPF 1988-1993 CODES FOR MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1988 CODES	1993 CODES	
		CONSUMER, PERSONAL, & MISC. SERVICES--UNSPECIFIED (CONT'D)
127	630	Other Consumer Services
	640	MECHANICS AND REPAIRERS--UNSPECIFIED
128	641	Electrical & Electronics Equipment Repair
129	642	Heating, Air Conditioning, & Refrigeration Mechanics
130	643	Vehicle & Mobile Equipment Mechanics & Repairers
131	644	Other Mechanics & Repairers
	660	PRECISION PRODUCTION--UNSPECIFIED
132	661	Drafting
133	662	Graphic & Print Communications
134	663	Leatherworking & Upholstering
135	664	Precision Metal Work
136	665	Woodworking
137	670	Other Precision Production Work
	680	TRANSPORTATION AND MATERIAL MOVING--UNSPECIFIED
138	681	Air Transportation (e.g., Piloting, Traffic Control, Flight Attendance, Aviation Management)
139	682	Land Vehicle & Equipment Operation
140	683	Water Transportation (e.g., Boat & Fishing Operations, Deep Water Diving, Marina Operations, Sailors & Deckhands)
141	690	Other Transportation & Material Moving
888	**900**	OTHER (IF YOU USE THIS CODE, BE SURE TO WRITE IN A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION AT QUESTIONS 12-13, AND 16)

Exhibit O-2: Derived Variable Crosswalk to NSOPF-88

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X01C35	Academic environment: Adequacy of internal funds for professional development		New.
X01C34	Academic environment: Overall quality of facilities or resources		New.
X01A9	Academic rank	Academic rank categories	Matches.
X01A10	Academic rank: Number of years since rank achieved	Academic rank--time in rank	Modified.
X01F52	Age	Age	Matches.
X02F52	Age: Distribution (matches 1988 NSOPF)	Age categories	Matches.
X03F52	Age: Modified distribution	Age categories	Modified.
X01A11	Appointment type	Appointment type	Matches.
X02A11	Appointment type and employment status		New.
X01B14	Awards: Undergraduate awards		New.
X37_0	Bureau of Economic Analysis region code		New.
X03F53	Citizenship and minority status		New.
X02F57	Citizenship: Current (modified NSOPF-88 categories)		Modified 1988 Question 46. Codes for other country specified.
X03F57	Citizenship: Status		New.
X01F56a	Citizenship: Status expanded		New.
X02E47	Compensation: Basic salary annualized		New.
X01E47	Compensation: Basic salary from institution	Compensation categories	Modified.
X03E47	Compensation: Other income from institution	Compensation categories	Modified.
X05E47	Compensation: Other outside income	Compensation categories	Modified.
X04E47	Compensation: Outside consulting income	Compensation categories--consulting income categories	Modified.
X06E47	Compensation: Total earned income	Compensation categories	Modified.
X01B16	Degree: Highest degree	Degree type	Modified.

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X03B16	Degree: Highest degree program area (matches NSOPF-88 categories)		Matches 1988 sort for "Program area categories".
X07B16	Degree: Highest degree program area (more detailed classification)		New.
X02B16	Degree: Highest degree year		New.
X01B18	Employment: Employment sector of main other Fall 1992 job		New.
X01B19	Employment: Employment sector of most recent main job ending before Fall 1992		New.
X01A6	Employment: Number of years in current position at institution	Employment--years at institution	Modified.
X01A4	Employment: Part-time faculty position only employment	Employment--other full-time employment (part-time faculty only)	Modified.
X06B16	Employment: Position at institution Fall 1992 first or only job since highest degree attained		New.
X02B18	Employment: Primary responsibility of main other Fall 1992 job		New.
X02B19	Employment: Primary responsibility of most recent main job		New.
X02D46	Future: Age likely to retire from all paid employment	Future--categories for age likely to retire	Modified.
X01D42	Future: Age likely to stop working at a postsecondary institution	Future--categories for age likely to stop teaching	Modified.
X05D41	Future: Likely to retire or accept a part- or full-time job in the next 3 years		New.
X03D41	Future: Very likely to accept a full-time job in the next 3 years		New.
X02D41	Future: Very likely to accept a part-time job in the next 3 years		New.
X01D41	Future: Very likely to retire in the next 3 years		New.
X04D41	Future: Very likely to retire or accept a part- or full-time job in the next 3 years	Future--plans	Matches.

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X01D46	Future: Years to retirement		New.
X05_0	Institution by Carnegie Classification I or II (1987)		New.
X07_0	Institution control (1991-92 IPEDS)		New.
X36_0	Institution expenditures collapsed: Educational and general		New.
X32_0	Institution expenditures collapsed: Instruction		New.
X34_0	Institution expenditures collapsed: Research		New.
X35_0	Institution expenditures: Educational and general		New.
X31_0	Institution expenditures: Instruction		New.
X33_0	Institution expenditures: Research		New.
X18_0	Institution size collapsed: FTE first-professional enrollment		New.
X22_0	Institution size collapsed: FTE graduate enrollment		New.
X14_0	Institution size collapsed: FTE undergraduate enrollment		New.
X16_0	Institution size collapsed: Number first-professional students enrolled		New.
X20_0	Institution size collapsed: Number graduate students enrolled		New.
X12_0	Institution size collapsed: Number undergraduate students enrolled		New.
X24_0	Institution size collapsed: Total enrollment		New.
X26_0	Institution size collapsed: Total FTE enrollment		New.
X17_0	Institution size: FTE first-professional enrollment		New.
X21_0	Institution size: FTE graduate enrollment		New.

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X13_0	Institution size: FTE undergraduate enrollment		New.
X15_0	Institution size: Number first-professional students enrolled		New.
X19_0	Institution size: Number graduate students enrolled		New.
X11_0	Institution size: Number undergraduate students enrolled		New.
X23_0	Institution size: Total enrollment		New.
X25_0	Institution size: Total FTE enrollment		New.
X01_0	Institution strata (matches NSOPF-88 categories)	Strata categories	Matches.
X02_0	Institution strata (modified NSOPF-88 categories)	Strata categories	Modified.
X04_0	Institution strata (modified NSOPF-93 sampling strata)		New.
X09_0	Institution strata (NSOPF-88 and modified 1994 Carnegie)		New.
X08_0	Institution strata (NSOPF-88 categories modified further)	Strata categories (collapsed)	Modified.
X06_0	Institution type (1991-92 IPEDS)		New.
X27_0	Minority enrollment: Percent American Indian/Alaskan Native		New.
X28_0	Minority enrollment: Percent Asian/Pacific Islander		New.
X29_0	Minority enrollment: Percent Black Non-Hispanic		New.
X30_0	Minority enrollment: Percent Hispanic		New.
X01_2	Primary activity, all (non-credit teachers included)		New.
X02_2	Primary activity, modified		New.
X03C33	Productivity, non-teaching: Average award (total funds divided by total grants/contracts)		New.

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X03B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for book reviews	Publications--number during career	Matches.
X02B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for books, chapters	Publications--number during career	Matches.
X06B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for number of publications	Publications--categories for number during career	Modified.
X07B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for number of years for total career refereed articles		New.
X04B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for other reports	Publications--number during career	Matches.
X05B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for presentations, exhibitions	Publications--number during career	Matches.
X01B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Career output for refereed articles	Publications--number during career	Matches.
X05C21	Productivity, non-teaching: Number of graduate committees chaired		New.
X02C21	Productivity, non-teaching: Number of graduate committees served on		New.
X04C21	Productivity, non-teaching: Number of undergraduate committees chaired		New.
X01C21	Productivity, non-teaching: Number of undergraduate committees served on		New.
X10B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Output past 2 years for book reviews	Publications--number during last 2 years	Matches.
X09B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Output past 2 years for books, chapters	Publications--number during last 2 years	Matches.
X13B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Output past 2 years for number of publications		New.
X11B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Output past 2 years for other reports	Publications--number during last 2 years	Matches.
X12B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Output past 2 years for presentations, exhibitions	Publications--number during last 2 years	Matches.

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X08B20	Productivity, non-teaching: Output past 2 years for refereed articles	Publications--number during last 2 years	Matches.
X06C21	Productivity, non-teaching: Total committees chaired		New.
X03C21	Productivity, non-teaching: Total committees served on		New.
X02C33	Productivity, non-teaching: Total funds		New.
X19C23	Productivity, teaching: Average number teaching assistants per class in 5 or fewer classes for credit		New.
X05C23	Productivity, teaching: Level of classroom instruction		New.
X01C25	Productivity, teaching: Level of individualized instruction		New.
X09C23	Productivity, teaching: Number of graduate classes taught for credit (5 or fewer)		New.
X14C23	Productivity, teaching: Number of students taught in 5 or fewer classes for credit		New.
X08C23	Productivity, teaching: Number of undergraduate classes taught for credit (5 or fewer)		New.
X03C23	Productivity teaching: Total classroom credit hours in 5 or fewer classes		New.
X04C23	Productivity teaching: Total classroom individual credit hours in 5 or fewer classes		New.
X02C23	Productivity teaching: Total classroom student contact hours per week in 5 or fewer classes for credit	Hours--student contact	Modified.
X08C25	Productivity, teaching: Total contact hours per week for graduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit		New.
X07C25	Productivity, teaching: Total contact hours per week for undergraduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit		New.

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X09C25	Productivity, teaching: Total contact hours per week of individualized instruction for credit		New.
X01C23	Productivity, teaching: Total hours spent teaching per week in 5 or fewer classes for credit	Hours--classroom	Modified.
X05C25	Productivity, teaching: Total number of graduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit		New.
X04C25	Productivity, teaching: Total number of undergraduate students receiving individualized instruction for credit		New.
X06C25	Productivity, teaching: Total students receiving individualized instruction for credit		New.
X02A13	Program area: Research categories (detailed classification)		New.
X01A13	Program area: Research categories (matches NSOPF-88 categories)		Matches 1988 sort for "Program area categories."
X02A12	Program area: Teaching categories (detailed classification)		New.
X01A12	Program area: Teaching categories (matches NSOPF-88 categories)	Program area--categories	Matches.
X03A12	Program area: Teaching or research (if no teaching area), detailed classification		New.
X01F53	Race		New.
X02F53	Race/ethnicity	Race/ethnicity	Modified.
X10_0	Ratio of FTE enrollment/FTE faculty		New.
X01_1	Role: Any instructional duties for credit		New.
X07_1	Role: Any instruction for credit with teaching as primary activity		New.
X03_1	Role: Duties collapsed		New.
X06_1	Role: Duties modified		New.

565

564

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXHIBIT O-2: DERIVED VARIABLE CROSSWALK TO NSOPF-88

NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE NAME	NSOPF-93 DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE	DERIVED VARIABLE TITLE FROM NSOPF-88	COMPARISON WITH NSOPF-88
X05_1	Role: Faculty status or instructional duties for credit		New.
X04_1	Role: Instructional duties by faculty status		New.
X02_1	Role: Specific duties and faculty status		New.
X01E49	SES: Average income per household member		New.
X01F55	SES: Family status	Marital status	Modified.
X01F58	SES: Parents' education		New.
X02A7	Tenure: Number of years tenured		New.
X01A7	Tenure: Tenure status	Tenure status categories	Modified.
X01C36	Time allocation: Average total hours per week worked	Hours--worked	Modified.
X07C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred in administration		New.
X08C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred in other activities		New.
X06C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred in research		New.
X05C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time preferred in teaching		New.
X03C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time spent in administration	Time allocation categories	Modified.
X04C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time spent in other activities	Time allocation categories	Modified.
X02C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time spent in research	Time allocation categories	Modified.
X01C37	Time allocation: Percentage of time spent teaching	Time allocation categories	Modified.
X01C38	Union member	Employment--unionized/collective bargaining	Modified.

Appendix P

Imputation Flags for the Institution Data File (Public-use)

Imputation Flags for the Faculty Data File (Restricted-use)

Imputation Flags for the Institution Data File (Public-use)

Variable: MA1A Numeric Pos: (2) 41-41

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A1A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	872	100.0%	100.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA1B Numeric Pos: (2) 42-42

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	862	98.9%	99.5%
Regression based	1	10	1.1%	0.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA1C Numeric Pos: (2) 43-43

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A1C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	859	98.5%	99.5%
Regression based	1	13	1.5%	0.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA1D Numeric Pos: (2) 44-44

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A1D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	846	97.0%	98.6%
Regression based	1	26	3.0%	1.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MAC1 Numeric Pos: (2) 45-45

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE AC1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	807	92.5%	91.9%
Regression based	1	65	7.5%	8.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MAC2 Numeric Pos: (2) 46-46

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE AC2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	819	93.9%	94.1%
Regression based	1	53	6.1%	5.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MAC3 Numeric Pos: (2) 47-47

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE AC3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	790	90.6%	89.8%
Regression based	1	82	9.4%	10.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MAC4 Numeric Pos: (2) 48-48

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE AC4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	825	94.6%	96.4%
Regression based	1	47	5.4%	3.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MAC5 Numeric Pos: (2) 49-49

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE AC5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	695	79.7%	76.3%
Regression based	1	177	20.3%	23.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MAC6 Numeric Pos: (2) 50-50

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE AC6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	700	80.3%	75.5%
Regression based	1	172	19.7%	24.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB10A Numeric Pos: (2) 51-51

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B10A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	853	97.8%	98.3%
Regression based	1	19	2.2%	1.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB10B Numeric Pos: (2) 52-52

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B10B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	854	97.9%	98.3%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	1.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB10C Numeric Pos: (2) 53-53

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B10C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	850	97.5%	97.7%
Regression based	1	22	2.5%	2.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB11 Numeric Pos: (2) 54-54

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B11

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	98.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	1.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB11A Numeric Pos: (2) 55-55

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B11A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	787	90.3%	93.1%
Regression based	1	85	9.7%	6.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB12A Numeric Pos: (2) 56-56

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	862	98.9%	99.0%
Regression based	1	10	1.1%	1.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB12A1 Numeric Pos: (2) 57-57

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	810	92.9%	92.0%
Regression based	1	62	7.1%	8.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB12B Numeric Pos: (2) 58-58

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	858	98.4%	98.5%
Regression based	1	14	1.6%	1.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB12B1 Numeric Pos: (2) 59-59

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	779	89.3%	88.5%
Regression based	1	93	10.7%	11.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB12C Numeric Pos: (2) 60-60

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	859	98.5%	98.8%
Regression based	1	13	1.5%	1.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MB12C1          Numeric       Pos: (2) 61-61

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12C1

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         795    91.2%  87.1%
Regression based .........     1          77     8.8%  12.9%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB12D           Numeric       Pos: (2) 62-62

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12D

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         859    98.5%  98.5%
Regression based .........     1          13     1.5%   1.5%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB12D1          Numeric       Pos: (2) 63-63

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12D1

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         765    87.7%  85.9%
Regression based .........     1         107    12.3%  14.1%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB12E           Numeric       Pos: (2) 64-64

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12E

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         860    98.6%  98.7%
Regression based .........     1          12     1.4%   1.3%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB12E1          Numeric       Pos: (2) 65-65

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B12E1

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         789    90.5%  88.5%
Regression based .........     1          83     9.5%  11.5%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13A           Numeric       Pos: (2) 66-66

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13A

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         867    99.4%  99.5%
Regression based .........     1           5     0.6%   0.5%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13A1          Numeric       Pos: (2) 67-67

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13A1

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         844    96.8%  96.1%
Regression based .........     1          28     3.2%   3.9%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13B           Numeric       Pos: (2) 68-68

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13B

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         866    99.3%  99.5%
Regression based .........     1           6     0.7%   0.5%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13B1          Numeric       Pos: (2) 69-69

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13B1

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         827    94.8%  93.3%
Regression based .........     1          45     5.2%   6.7%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13C           Numeric       Pos: (2) 70-70

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13C

                                                PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............     0         866    99.3%  99.5%
Regression based .........     1           6     0.7%   0.5%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13C1          Numeric        Pos: (2) 71-71

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13C1

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          839    96.2%   96.0%
Regression based .........      1           33     3.8%    4.0%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13D           Numeric        Pos: (2) 72-72

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13D

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          867    99.4%   99.5%
Regression based .........      1            5     0.6%    0.5%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13D1          Numeric        Pos: (2) 73-73

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13D1

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          828    95.0%   94.7%
Regression based .........      1           44     5.0%    5.3%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13E           Numeric        Pos: (2) 74-74

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13E

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          867    99.4%   99.5%
Regression based .........      1            5     0.6%    0.5%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13E1          Numeric        Pos: (2) 75-75

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13E1

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          822    94.3%   94.2%
Regression based .........      1           50     5.7%    5.8%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13F           Numeric        Pos: (2) 76-76

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13F

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          866    99.3%   98.9%
Regression based .........      1            6     0.7%    1.1%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13F1          Numeric        Pos: (2) 77-77

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13F1

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          843    96.7%   95.0%
Regression based .........      1           29     3.3%    5.0%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13G           Numeric        Pos: (2) 78-78

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13G

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          867    99.4%   99.5%
Regression based .........      1            5     0.6%    0.5%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13G1          Numeric        Pos: (2) 79-79

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13G1

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          843    96.7%   95.7%
Regression based .........      1           29     3.3%    4.3%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB13H           Numeric        Pos: (2) 80-80

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13H

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............      0          867    99.4%   99.5%
Regression based .........      1            5     0.6%    0.5%

TOTALS:                                    872   100.0%  100.0%
```

Variable: MB13H1 Numeric Pos: (2) 81-81

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13H1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	858	98.4%	98.4%
Regression based	1	14	1.6%	1.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13I Numeric Pos: (2) 82-82

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	866	99.3%	99.5%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13I1 Numeric Pos: (2) 83-83

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13I1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.9%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13J Numeric Pos: (2) 84-84

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	867	99.4%	99.5%
Regression based	1	5	0.6%	0.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13J1 Numeric Pos: (2) 85-85

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13J1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	98.3%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	1.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13K Numeric Pos: (2) 86-86

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	865	99.2%	98.9%
Regression based	1	7	0.8%	1.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13K1 Numeric Pos: (2) 87-87

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13K1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	849	97.4%	97.3%
Regression based	1	23	2.6%	2.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13L Numeric Pos: (2) 88-88

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13L

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	865	99.2%	98.9%
Regression based	1	7	0.8%	1.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13L1 Numeric Pos: (2) 89-89

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13L1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	800	91.7%	93.2%
Regression based	1	72	8.3%	6.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13M Numeric Pos: (2) 90-90

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13M

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	866	99.3%	99.5%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13M1 Numeric Pos: (2) 91-91

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13M1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	808	92.7%	93.2%
Regression based	1	64	7.3%	6.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13N Numeric Pos: (2) 92-92

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13N

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	865	99.2%	98.9%
Regression based	1	7	0.8%	1.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13N1 Numeric Pos: (2) 93-93

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13N1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	821	94.2%	94.7%
Regression based	1	51	5.8%	5.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13O Numeric Pos: (2) 94-94

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13O

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	866	99.3%	99.0%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	1.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB13O1 Numeric Pos: (2) 95-95

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B13O1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	839	96.2%	95.9%
Regression based	1	33	3.8%	4.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB14 Numeric Pos: (2) 96-96

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B14

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	836	95.9%	94.6%
Regression based	1	36	4.1%	5.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15 Numeric Pos: (2) 97-97

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	846	97.0%	96.1%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.7%
Dont know imputd	3	20	2.3%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16A Numeric Pos: (2) 98-98

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	843	96.7%	96.0%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	23	2.6%	3.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16A1 Numeric Pos: (2) 99-99

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	830	95.2%	94.9%
Regression based	1	42	4.8%	5.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16B Numeric Pos: (2) 100-100

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	844	96.8%	96.0%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16B1 Numeric Pos: (2) 101-101

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	822	94.3%	93.4%
Regression based	1	50	5.7%	6.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16C Numeric Pos: (2) 102-102

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	842	96.6%	95.8%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	24	2.8%	3.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16C1 Numeric Pos: (2) 103-103

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16C1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	826	94.7%	93.7%
Regression based	1	46	5.3%	6.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16D Numeric Pos: (2) 104-104

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	840	96.3%	95.6%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	26	3.0%	3.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16D1 Numeric Pos: (2) 105-105

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16D1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	819	93.9%	93.7%
Regression based	1	53	6.1%	6.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16E Numeric Pos: (2) 106-106

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	840	96.3%	95.6%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	26	3.0%	3.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16E1 Numeric Pos: (2) 107-107

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16E1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	813	93.2%	93.1%
Regression based	1	59	6.8%	6.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16F Numeric Pos: (2) 108-108

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	844	96.8%	96.0%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16F1 Numeric Pos: (2) 109-109

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16F1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	828	95.0%	93.8%
Regression based	1	44	5.0%	6.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16G Numeric Pos: (2) 110-110

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	844	96.8%	95.9%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16G1 Numeric Pos: (2) 111-111

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16G1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	828	95.0%	94.1%
Regression based	1	44	5.0%	5.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16H Numeric Pos: (2) 112-112

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	844	96.8%	96.0%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16H1 Numeric Pos: (2) 113-113

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16H1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	837	96.0%	94.9%
Regression based	1	35	4.0%	5.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16I Numeric Pos: (2) 114-114

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	844	96.8%	96.0%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16I1 Numeric Pos: (2) 115-115

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16I1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	836	95.9%	95.4%
Regression based	1	36	4.1%	4.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MB16J          Numeric      Pos: (2) 116-116

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16J

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     845    96.9%  96.0%
Regression based .........       1       6     0.7%   0.6%
Dont know imputd .........       3      21     2.4%   3.4%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB16J1         Numeric      Pos: (2) 117-117

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16J1

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     837    96.0%  95.4%
Regression based .........       1      35     4.0%   4.6%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB16K          Numeric      Pos: (2) 118-118

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16K

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     845    96.9%  96.0%
Regression based .........       1       6     0.7%   0.6%
Dont know imputd .........       3      21     2.4%   3.4%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB16K1         Numeric      Pos: (2) 119-119

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16K1

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     829    95.1%  94.3%
Regression based .........       1      43     4.9%   5.7%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB16L          Numeric      Pos: (2) 120-120

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16L

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     837    96.0%  95.5%
Regression based .........       1       6     0.7%   0.6%
Dont know imputd .........       3      29     3.3%   3.9%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB16L1         Numeric      Pos: (2) 121-121

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16L1

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     801    91.9%  92.6%
Regression based .........       1      71     8.1%   7.4%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB16M          Numeric      Pos: (2) 122-122

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16M

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     836    95.9%  95.0%
Regression based .........       1       6     0.7%   0.6%
Dont know imputd .........       3      30     3.4%   4.4%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB16M1         Numeric      Pos: (2) 123-123

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16M1

                                               PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                  CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     804    92.2%  92.7%
Regression based .........       1      68     7.8%   7.3%

TOTALS:                                872   100.0% 100.0%
```

Variable: MB16N Numeric Pos: (2) 124-124

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16N

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	836	95.9%	94.8%
Regression based	1	7	0.8%	0.7%
Dont know imputd	3	29	3.3%	4.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16N1 Numeric Pos: (2) 125-125

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16N1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	814	93.3%	93.4%
Regression based	1	58	6.7%	6.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16O Numeric Pos: (2) 126-126

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16O

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	845	96.9%	96.0%
Regression based	1	6	0.7%	0.6%
Dont know imputd	3	21	2.4%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16O1 Numeric Pos: (2) 127-127

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16O1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	825	94.6%	94.0%
Regression based	1	47	5.4%	6.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB17 Numeric Pos: (2) 128-128

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B17

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	795	91.2%	91.8%
Regression based	1	77	8.8%	8.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB18A Numeric Pos: (2) 129-129

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	851	97.6%	98.1%
Regression based	1	12	1.4%	0.9%
Dont know imputd	3	9	1.0%	0.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB18B Numeric Pos: (2) 130-130

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	784	89.9%	93.4%
Regression based	1	13	1.5%	1.0%
Dont know imputd	3	75	8.6%	5.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB18C Numeric Pos: (2) 131-131

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	792	90.8%	93.8%
Regression based	1	13	1.5%	1.0%
Dont know imputd	3	67	7.7%	5.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MB18D          Numeric      Pos: (2) 132-132

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18D

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     723   82.9%  87.7%
Regression based .........       1      13    1.5%   1.0%
Dont know imputd .........       3     136   15.6%  11.3%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB18E          Numeric      Pos: (2) 133-133

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18E

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     845   96.9%  97.3%
Regression based .........       1      12    1.4%   0.9%
Dont know imputd .........       3      15    1.7%   1.7%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB18F          Numeric      Pos: (2) 134-134

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18F

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     842   96.6%  97.3%
Regression based .........       1      12    1.4%   0.9%
Dont know imputd .........       3      18    2.1%   1.8%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB18G          Numeric      Pos: (2) 135-135

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18G

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     821   94.2%  95.6%
Regression based .........       1      12    1.4%   0.9%
Dont know imputd .........       3      39    4.5%   3.5%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB18H          Numeric      Pos: (2) 136-136

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18H

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     788   90.4%  93.9%
Regression based .........       1      12    1.4%   0.9%
Dont know imputd .........       3      72    8.3%   5.2%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB18I          Numeric      Pos: (2) 137-137

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18I

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     757   86.8%  89.6%
Regression based .........       1      12    1.4%   0.9%
Dont know imputd .........       3     103   11.8%   9.5%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB19           Numeric      Pos: (2) 138-138

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     865   99.2%  99.0%
Regression based .........       1       7    0.8%   1.0%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB19A          Numeric      Pos: (2) 139-139

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19A

                                              PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                CODES    FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............       0     849   97.4%  97.7%
Regression based .........       1      23    2.6%   2.3%

TOTALS:                                872  100.0% 100.0%
```

Variable: MB2A Numeric Pos: (2) 140-140

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B2A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	872	100.0%	100.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB2B Numeric Pos: (2) 141-141

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B2B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	826	94.7%	96.2%
Regression based	1	46	5.3%	3.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB2C Numeric Pos: (2) 142-142

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B2C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	821	94.2%	96.0%
Regression based	1	51	5.8%	4.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB2D Numeric Pos: (2) 143-143

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B2D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	821	94.2%	96.0%
Regression based	1	51	5.8%	4.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB2E Numeric Pos: (2) 144-144

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B2E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	808	92.7%	94.8%
Regression based	1	64	7.3%	5.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB2F Numeric Pos: (2) 145-145

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B2F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	843	96.7%	98.3%
Regression based	1	29	3.3%	1.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB3 Numeric Pos: (2) 146-146

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	751	86.1%	92.1%
Regression based	1	121	13.9%	7.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB4 Numeric Pos: (2) 147-147

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	822	94.3%	96.1%
Regression based	1	50	5.7%	3.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB4A Numeric Pos: (2) 148-148

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B4A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	783	89.8%	94.4%
Regression based	1	89	10.2%	5.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB5 Numeric Pos: (2) 149-149

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	872	100.0%	100.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MB6A          Numeric      Pos: (2) 150-150

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B6A

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       856   98.2%  98.5%
Regression based ..........        1        16    1.8%   1.5%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB6B          Numeric      Pos: (2) 151-151

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B6B

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       844   96.8%  97.4%
Regression based ..........        1        28    3.2%   2.6%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB6C          Numeric      Pos: (2) 152-152

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B6C

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       840   96.3%  97.5%
Regression based ..........        1        32    3.7%   2.5%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB6D          Numeric      Pos: (2) 153-153

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B6D

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       827   94.8%  96.4%
Regression based ..........        1        45    5.2%   3.6%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB7A          Numeric      Pos: (2) 154-154

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B7A

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       816   93.6%  96.6%
Regression based ..........        1        56    6.4%   3.4%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB7B          Numeric      Pos: (2) 155-155

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B7B

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       830   95.2%  97.5%
Regression based ..........        1        42    4.8%   2.5%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB7C          Numeric      Pos: (2) 156-156

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B7C

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       783   89.8%  92.5%
Regression based ..........        1        89   10.2%   7.5%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB8A          Numeric      Pos: (2) 157-157

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B8A

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       786   90.1%  93.8%
Regression based ..........        1        86    9.9%   6.2%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB8B          Numeric      Pos: (2) 158-158

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B8B

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       812   93.1%  95.6%
Regression based ..........        1        60    6.9%   4.4%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB9A          Numeric      Pos: (2) 159-159

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B9A

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                     CODES     FREQ    CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............        0       837   96.0%  96.1%
Regression based ..........        1        35    4.0%   3.9%

TOTALS:                                    872  100.0% 100.0%
```

Variable: MB9B Numeric Pos: (2) 160-160

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B9B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	835	95.8%	95.6%
Regression based	1	37	4.2%	4.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC20A Numeric Pos: (2) 161-161

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C20A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	826	94.7%	95.5%
Regression based	1	24	2.8%	3.1%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	1.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC20B Numeric Pos: (2) 162-162

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C20B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	782	89.7%	92.3%
Regression based	1	44	5.0%	4.3%
Dont know imputd	3	46	5.3%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC20C Numeric Pos: (2) 163-163

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C20C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	775	88.9%	92.1%
Regression based	1	44	5.0%	4.2%
Dont know imputd	3	53	6.1%	3.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC20D Numeric Pos: (2) 164-164

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C20D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	775	88.9%	92.4%
Regression based	1	49	5.6%	4.4%
Dont know imputd	3	48	5.5%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC20E Numeric Pos: (2) 165-165

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C20E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	771	88.4%	92.1%
Regression based	1	47	5.4%	4.1%
Dont know imputd	3	54	6.2%	3.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC20F Numeric Pos: (2) 166-166

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C20F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	803	92.1%	93.4%
Regression based	1	36	4.1%	3.9%
Dont know imputd	3	33	3.8%	2.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21 Numeric Pos: (2) 167-167

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	858	98.4%	98.2%
Regression based	1	14	1.6%	1.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MC22A          Numeric       Pos: (2) 168-168

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C22A

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       837     96.0%  96.5%
Regression based ..........     1        35      4.0%   3.5%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC22B          Numeric       Pos: (2) 169-169

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C22B

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       829     95.1%  96.3%
Regression based ..........     1        43      4.9%   3.7%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC22C          Numeric       Pos: (2) 170-170

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C22C

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       829     95.1%  95.9%
Regression based ..........     1        43      4.9%   4.1%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC22D          Numeric       Pos: (2) 171-171

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C22D

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       825     94.6%  96.1%
Regression based ..........     1        47      5.4%   3.9%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC23A          Numeric       Pos: (2) 172-172

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       836     95.9%  97.2%
Regression based ..........     1        36      4.1%   2.8%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC23B          Numeric       Pos: (2) 173-173

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       842     96.6%  97.4%
Regression based ..........     1        30      3.4%   2.6%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC23C          Numeric       Pos: (2) 174-174

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       832     95.4%  96.9%
Regression based ..........     1        40      4.6%   3.1%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC24A          Numeric       Pos: (2) 175-175

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24A

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       826     94.7%  95.8%
Regression based ..........     1        46      5.3%   4.2%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC24B          Numeric       Pos: (2) 176-176

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24B

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       826     94.7%  95.9%
Regression based ..........     1        46      5.3%   4.1%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC25A          Numeric       Pos: (2) 177-177

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25A

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                CODES      FREQ      CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0       832     95.4%  96.0%
Regression based ..........     1        40      4.6%   4.0%

TOTALS:                                 872    100.0% 100.0%
```

Variable: MC25B Numeric Pos: (2) 178-178

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	831	95.3%	95.4%
Regression based	1	41	4.7%	4.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC26A Numeric Pos: (2) 179-179

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C26A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	838	96.1%	96.7%
Regression based	1	34	3.9%	3.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC26B Numeric Pos: (2) 180-180

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C26B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	840	96.3%	96.5%
Regression based	1	32	3.7%	3.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC26C Numeric Pos: (2) 181-181

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C26C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	838	96.1%	96.4%
Regression based	1	34	3.9%	3.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC27 Numeric Pos: (2) 182-182

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C27

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	838	96.1%	96.4%
Regression based	1	34	3.9%	3.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC27A Numeric Pos: (2) 183-183

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C27A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	794	91.1%	93.4%
Regression based	1	78	8.9%	6.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC28A Numeric Pos: (2) 184-184

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	849	97.4%	96.2%
Regression based	1	23	2.6%	3.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC28A1 Numeric Pos: (2) 185-185

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	819	93.9%	92.3%
Regression based	1	53	6.1%	7.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC28B Numeric Pos: (2) 186-186

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	846	97.0%	95.7%
Regression based	1	26	3.0%	4.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC28B1 Numeric Pos: (2) 187-187

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	797	91.4%	90.2%
Regression based	1	75	8.6%	9.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MC28C          Numeric       Pos: (2) 188-188

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28C

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        850    97.5%   96.4%
Regression based ..........     1         22     2.5%    3.6%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC28C1         Numeric       Pos: (2) 189-189

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28C1

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        811    93.0%   89.8%
Regression based ..........     1         61     7.0%   10.2%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC28D          Numeric       Pos: (2) 190-190

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28D

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        845    96.9%   95.7%
Regression based ..........     1         27     3.1%    4.3%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC28D1         Numeric       Pos: (2) 191-191

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28D1

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        786    90.1%   88.5%
Regression based ..........     1         86     9.9%   11.5%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC28E          Numeric       Pos: (2) 192-192

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28E

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        845    96.9%   95.7%
Regression based ..........     1         27     3.1%    4.3%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC28E1         Numeric       Pos: (2) 193-193

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28E1

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        790    90.6%   88.8%
Regression based ..........     1         82     9.4%   11.2%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29A          Numeric       Pos: (2) 194-194

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29A

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        856    98.2%   97.6%
Regression based ..........     1         16     1.8%    2.4%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29A1         Numeric       Pos: (2) 195-195

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29A1

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        847    97.1%   96.5%
Regression based ..........     1         25     2.9%    3.5%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29B          Numeric       Pos: (2) 196-196

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29B

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        856    98.2%   97.6%
Regression based ..........     1         16     1.8%    2.4%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29B1         Numeric       Pos: (2) 197-197

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29B1

                                                 PER-   WGHTD
    RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ...............     0        826    94.7%   92.9%
Regression based ..........     1         46     5.3%    7.1%

TOTALS:                                  872   100.0%  100.0%
```

Variable: MC29C Numeric Pos: (2) 198-198

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29C1 Numeric Pos: (2) 199-199

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29C1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	838	96.1%	95.0%
Regression based	1	34	3.9%	5.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29D Numeric Pos: (2) 200-200

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	854	97.9%	97.1%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29D1 Numeric Pos: (2) 201-201

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29D1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	831	95.3%	94.2%
Regression based	1	41	4.7%	5.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29E Numeric Pos: (2) 202-202

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29E1 Numeric Pos: (2) 203-203

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29E1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	829	95.1%	93.6%
Regression based	1	43	4.9%	6.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29F Numeric Pos: (2) 204-204

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29F1 Numeric Pos: (2) 205-205

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29F1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	839	96.2%	94.3%
Regression based	1	33	3.8%	5.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29G Numeric Pos: (2) 206-206

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29G1 Numeric Pos: (2) 207-207

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29G1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	841	96.4%	94.5%
Regression based	1	31	3.6%	5.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29H Numeric Pos: (2) 208-208

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29H1 Numeric Pos: (2) 209-209

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29H1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	847	97.1%	96.9%
Regression based	1	25	2.9%	3.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29I Numeric Pos: (2) 210-210

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29I1 Numeric Pos: (2) 211-211

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29I1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	848	97.2%	96.2%
Regression based	1	24	2.8%	3.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29J Numeric Pos: (2) 212-212

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.6%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29J1 Numeric Pos: (2) 213-213

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29J1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	848	97.2%	96.1%
Regression based	1	24	2.8%	3.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29K Numeric Pos: (2) 214-214

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	855	98.1%	97.5%
Regression based	1	17	1.9%	2.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29K1 Numeric Pos: (2) 215-215

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29K1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	845	96.9%	96.4%
Regression based	1	27	3.1%	3.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29L Numeric Pos: (2) 216-216

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29L

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	855	98.1%	97.5%
Regression based	1	17	1.9%	2.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29L1 Numeric Pos: (2) 217-217

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29L1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	807	92.5%	93.6%
Regression based	1	65	7.5%	6.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MC29M            Numeric        Pos: (2) 218-218

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29M

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       855     98.1%  97.5%
Regression based ..........      1        17      1.9%   2.5%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29M1           Numeric        Pos: (2) 219-219

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29M1

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       814     93.3%  94.1%
Regression based ..........      1        58      6.7%   5.9%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29N            Numeric        Pos: (2) 220-220

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29N

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       852     97.7%  96.5%
Regression based ..........      1        20      2.3%   3.5%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29N1           Numeric        Pos: (2) 221-221

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29N1

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       824     94.5%  94.3%
Regression based ..........      1        48      5.5%   5.7%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29O            Numeric        Pos: (2) 222-222

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29O

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       854     97.9%  96.4%
Regression based ..........      1        18      2.1%   3.6%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC29O1           Numeric        Pos: (2) 223-223

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29O1

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       838     96.1%  95.3%
Regression based ..........      1        34      3.9%   4.7%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC30             Numeric        Pos: (2) 224-224

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C30

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       840     96.3%  94.6%
Regression based ..........      1        32      3.7%   5.4%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC31             Numeric        Pos: (2) 225-225

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C31

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       825     94.6%  94.2%
Regression based ..........      1        27      3.1%   2.6%
Dont know imputd ..........      3        20      2.3%   3.2%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC32A            Numeric        Pos: (2) 226-226

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32A

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............      0       822     94.3%  94.0%
Regression based ..........      1        28      3.2%   2.7%
Dont know imputd ..........      3        22      2.5%   3.3%

TOTALS:                                  872    100.0% 100.0%
```

Variable: MC32A1 Numeric Pos: (2) 227-227

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	814	93.3%	93.5%
Regression based	1	58	6.7%	6.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32B Numeric Pos: (2) 228-228

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	823	94.4%	94.1%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	21	2.4%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32B1 Numeric Pos: (2) 229-229

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	809	92.8%	92.8%
Regression based	1	63	7.2%	7.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32C Numeric Pos: (2) 230-230

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	822	94.3%	94.0%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32C1 Numeric Pos: (2) 231-231

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32C1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	813	93.2%	93.2%
Regression based	1	59	6.8%	6.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32D Numeric Pos: (2) 232-232

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	822	94.3%	94.0%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32D1 Numeric Pos: (2) 233-233

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32D1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	812	93.1%	93.2%
Regression based	1	60	6.9%	6.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32E Numeric Pos: (2) 234-234

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	821	94.2%	94.0%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	23	2.6%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32E1 Numeric Pos: (2) 235-235

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32E1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	806	92.4%	92.9%
Regression based	1	66	7.6%	7.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32F Numeric Pos: (2) 236-236

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	822	94.3%	94.0%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32F1 Numeric Pos: (2) 237-237

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32F1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	809	92.8%	92.8%
Regression based	1	63	7.2%	7.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32G Numeric Pos: (2) 238-238

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	822	94.3%	94.0%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	22	2.5%	3.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32G1 Numeric Pos: (2) 239-239

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32G1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	807	92.5%	92.8%
Regression based	1	65	7.5%	7.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32H Numeric Pos: (2) 240-240

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	823	94.4%	94.1%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	21	2.4%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32H1 Numeric Pos: (2) 241-241

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32H1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	817	93.7%	93.8%
Regression based	1	55	6.3%	6.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32I Numeric Pos: (2) 242-242

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	823	94.4%	94.1%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	21	2.4%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32I1 Numeric Pos: (2) 243-243

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32I1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	817	93.7%	93.7%
Regression based	1	55	6.3%	6.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32J Numeric Pos: (2) 244-244

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	823	94.4%	94.1%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	21	2.4%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32J1 Numeric Pos: (2) 245-245

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32J1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	816	93.6%	93.7%
Regression based	1	56	6.4%	6.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32K Numeric Pos: (2) 246-246

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	823	94.4%	94.1%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	21	2.4%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32K1 Numeric Pos: (2) 247-247

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32K1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	817	93.7%	93.7%
Regression based	1	55	6.3%	6.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32L Numeric Pos: (2) 248-248

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32L

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	820	94.0%	93.9%
Regression based	1	29	3.3%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	23	2.6%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32L1 Numeric Pos: (2) 249-249

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32L1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	797	91.4%	92.7%
Regression based	1	75	8.6%	7.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32M Numeric Pos: (2) 250-250

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32M

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	819	93.9%	93.9%
Regression based	1	29	3.3%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	24	2.8%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32M1 Numeric Pos: (2) 251-251

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32M1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	798	91.5%	92.7%
Regression based	1	74	8.5%	7.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32N Numeric Pos: (2) 252-252

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32N

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	820	94.0%	93.9%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	24	2.8%	3.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32N1 Numeric Pos: (2) 253-253

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32N1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	806	92.4%	93.2%
Regression based	1	66	7.6%	6.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32O Numeric Pos: (2) 254-254

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32O

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	823	94.4%	94.1%
Regression based	1	28	3.2%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	21	2.4%	3.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32O1 Numeric Pos: (2) 255-255

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32O1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	813	93.2%	93.6%
Regression based	1	59	6.8%	6.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33 Numeric Pos: (2) 256-256

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	859	98.5%	98.8%
Regression based	1	13	1.5%	1.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33A Numeric Pos: (2) 257-257

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	858	98.4%	98.8%
Regression based	1	14	1.6%	1.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD34 Numeric Pos: (2) 258-258

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D34

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	856	98.2%	97.9%
Regression based	1	16	1.8%	2.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35A Numeric Pos: (2) 259-259

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	845	96.9%	97.2%
Regression based	1	24	2.8%	2.6%
Dont know imputd	3	3	0.3%	0.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35A1 Numeric Pos: (2) 260-260

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	812	93.1%	93.8%
Regression based	1	60	6.9%	6.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35B Numeric Pos: (2) 261-261

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	840	96.3%	96.5%
Regression based	1	26	3.0%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	6	0.7%	0.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35B1 Numeric Pos: (2) 262-262

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	797	91.4%	92.0%
Regression based	1	75	8.6%	8.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35C Numeric Pos: (2) 263-263

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	847	97.1%	97.2%
Regression based	1	23	2.6%	2.5%
Dont know imputd	3	2	0.2%	0.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35C1 Numeric Pos: (2) 264-264

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35C1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	804	92.2%	91.8%
Regression based	1	68	7.8%	8.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35D Numeric Pos: (2) 265-265

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	843	96.7%	96.6%
Regression based	1	25	2.9%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	4	0.5%	0.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35D1 Numeric Pos: (2) 266-266

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35D1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	783	89.8%	90.3%
Regression based	1	89	10.2%	9.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35E Numeric Pos: (2) 267-267

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	845	96.9%	96.9%
Regression based	1	25	2.9%	2.6%
Dont know imputd	3	2	0.2%	0.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD35E1 Numeric Pos: (2) 268-268

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D35E1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	799	91.6%	92.4%
Regression based	1	73	8.4%	7.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD36 Numeric Pos: (2) 269-269

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D36

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	859	98.5%	98.0%
Regression based	1	13	1.5%	2.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37A Numeric Pos: (2) 270-270

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	849	97.4%	96.8%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	5	0.6%	0.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37A1 Numeric Pos: (2) 271-271

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	833	95.5%	94.3%
Regression based	1	39	4.5%	5.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37B Numeric Pos: (2) 272-272

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	849	97.4%	96.5%
Regression based	1	19	2.2%	2.5%
Dont know imputd	3	4	0.5%	1.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37B1 Numeric Pos: (2) 273-273

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	829	95.1%	94.6%
Regression based	1	43	4.9%	5.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37C Numeric Pos: (2) 274-274

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	849	97.4%	96.6%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	5	0.6%	1.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37C1 Numeric Pos: (2) 275-275

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37C1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	835	95.8%	95.5%
Regression based	1	37	4.2%	4.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37D Numeric Pos: (2) 276-276

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	847	97.1%	95.9%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	7	0.8%	1.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37D1 Numeric Pos: (2) 277-277

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37D1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	830	95.2%	94.4%
Regression based	1	42	4.8%	5.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37E Numeric Pos: (2) 278-278

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	848	97.2%	96.3%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	6	0.7%	1.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37E1 Numeric Pos: (2) 279-279

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37E1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	827	94.8%	94.4%
Regression based	1	45	5.2%	5.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37F Numeric Pos: (2) 280-280

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	850	97.5%	96.6%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	4	0.5%	1.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37F1 Numeric Pos: (2) 281-281

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37F1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	834	95.6%	94.5%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	5.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37G Numeric Pos: (2) 282-282

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	851	97.6%	97.1%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	3	0.3%	0.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37G1 Numeric Pos: (2) 283-283

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37G1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	833	95.5%	94.9%
Regression based	1	39	4.5%	5.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37H Numeric Pos: (2) 284-284

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	848	97.2%	96.8%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	6	0.7%	0.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37H1 Numeric Pos: (2) 285-285

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37H1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	834	95.6%	95.4%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	4.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37I Numeric Pos: (2) 286-286

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	850	97.5%	97.0%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	4	0.5%	0.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37I1 Numeric Pos: (2) 287-287

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37I1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	841	96.4%	96.3%
Regression based	1	31	3.6%	3.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37J Numeric Pos: (2) 288-288

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	852	97.7%	97.1%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	2	0.2%	0.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37J1 Numeric Pos: (2) 289-289

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37J1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	842	96.6%	96.2%
Regression based	1	30	3.4%	3.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37K Numeric Pos: (2) 290-290

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	850	97.5%	97.0%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	4	0.5%	0.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37K1 Numeric Pos: (2) 291-291

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37K1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	839	96.2%	95.8%
Regression based	1	33	3.8%	4.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37L Numeric Pos: (2) 292-292

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37L

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	845	96.9%	95.7%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	9	1.0%	1.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37L1 Numeric Pos: (2) 293-293

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37L1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	810	92.9%	93.0%
Regression based	1	62	7.1%	7.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37M Numeric Pos: (2) 294-294

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37M

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	844	96.8%	95.7%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	10	1.1%	2.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37M1 Numeric Pos: (2) 295-295

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37M1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	808	92.7%	92.7%
Regression based	1	64	7.3%	7.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37N Numeric Pos: (2) 296-296

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37N

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	845	96.9%	96.0%
Regression based	1	18	2.1%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	9	1.0%	1.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37N1 Numeric Pos: (2) 297-297

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37N1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	818	93.8%	93.3%
Regression based	1	54	6.2%	6.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37O Numeric Pos: (2) 298-298

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37O

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	849	97.4%	96.1%
Regression based	1	19	2.2%	2.4%
Dont know imputd	3	4	0.5%	1.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37O1 Numeric Pos: (2) 299-299

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37O1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	834	95.6%	94.6%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	5.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37P Numeric Pos: (2) 300-300

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37P

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	828	95.0%	94.2%
Regression based	1	20	2.3%	2.8%
Dont know imputd	3	24	2.8%	3.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD37P1 Numeric Pos: (2) 301-301

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D37P1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	728	83.5%	84.5%
Regression based	1	144	16.5%	15.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD38 Numeric Pos: (2) 302-302

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D38

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	744	85.3%	87.0%
Regression based	1	128	14.7%	13.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD39 Numeric Pos: (2) 303-303

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D39

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	852	97.7%	97.4%
Regression based	1	20	2.3%	2.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40A Numeric Pos: (2) 304-304

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	795	91.2%	92.2%
Regression based	1	64	7.3%	6.2%
Dont know imputd	3	13	1.5%	1.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40A1 Numeric Pos: (2) 305-305

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	748	85.8%	87.7%
Regression based	1	124	14.2%	12.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40A2 Numeric Pos: (2) 306-306

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	718	82.3%	85.5%
Regression based	1	154	17.7%	14.5%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40B Numeric Pos: (2) 307-307

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	801	91.9%	92.7%
Regression based	1	58	6.7%	6.0%
Dont know imputd	3	13	1.5%	1.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40B1 Numeric Pos: (2) 308-308

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	791	90.7%	92.0%
Regression based	1	81	9.3%	8.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40B2 Numeric Pos: (2) 309-309

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	721	82.7%	87.7%
Regression based	1	151	17.3%	12.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40C Numeric Pos: (2) 310-310

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	764	87.6%	88.8%
Regression based	1	89	10.2%	9.2%
Dont know imputd	3	19	2.2%	2.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40C2 Numeric Pos: (2) 311-311

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40C2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	690	79.1%	84.0%
Regression based	1	182	20.9%	16.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD41 Numeric Pos: (2) 312-312

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D41

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	776	89.0%	91.9%
Regression based	1	96	11.0%	8.1%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42A Numeric Pos: (2) 313-313

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	810	92.9%	94.3%
Regression based	1	39	4.5%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	23	2.6%	2.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42B Numeric Pos: (2) 314-314

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	751	86.1%	89.9%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	83	9.5%	6.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42C Numeric Pos: (2) 315-315

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	751	86.1%	90.3%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	83	9.5%	6.2%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42D Numeric Pos: (2) 316-316

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	702	80.5%	85.9%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	132	15.1%	10.6%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42E Numeric Pos: (2) 317-317

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	799	91.6%	93.6%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	35	4.0%	2.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42F Numeric Pos: (2) 318-318

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	777	89.1%	92.6%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	57	6.5%	4.0%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42G Numeric Pos: (2) 319-319

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	756	86.7%	90.7%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	3.4%
Dont know imputd	3	78	8.9%	5.9%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42H Numeric Pos: (2) 320-320

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	730	83.7%	88.8%
Regression based	1	38	4.4%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	104	11.9%	7.7%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42I Numeric Pos: (2) 321-321

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	712	81.7%	86.7%
Regression based	1	39	4.5%	3.5%
Dont know imputd	3	121	13.9%	9.8%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43 Numeric Pos: (2) 322-322

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	840	96.3%	96.7%
Regression based	1	32	3.7%	3.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43A Numeric Pos: (2) 323-323

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	827	94.8%	95.6%
Regression based	1	45	5.2%	4.4%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME1 Numeric Pos: (2) 324-324

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	840	96.3%	96.7%
Regression based	1	32	3.7%	3.3%
TOTALS:		872	100.0%	100.0%

Imputation Flags for the Faculty Data File (Restricted-use)

```
Variable: SA4            Numeric      Pos: (2) 987-987

COLD DECK IMPUTATION FLAG FOR A4

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25703    99.7%   99.6%
Directly imputd ..........        1         77     0.3%    0.4%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: SF51           Numeric      Pos: (2) 988-988

COLD DECK IMPUTATION FLAG FOR F51

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25683    99.6%   99.6%
Directly imputd ..........        1         97     0.4%    0.4%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: SF53A          Numeric      Pos: (2) 989-989

COLD DECK IMPUTATION FOR FLAG FOR F53A

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25550    99.1%   99.1%
Directly imputd ..........        1        230     0.9%    0.9%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA4            Numeric      Pos: (2) 994-994

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A4

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25761    99.9%   99.9%
Regression based .........        1         19     0.1%    0.1%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA4AA          Numeric      Pos: (2) 995-995

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A4AA

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25232    97.9%   96.5%
Regression based .........        1        548     2.1%    3.5%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA4AB          Numeric      Pos: (2) 996-996

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A4AB

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25240    97.9%   96.5%
Regression based .........        1        540     2.1%    3.5%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA4AC          Numeric      Pos: (2) 997-997

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A4AC

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25233    97.9%   96.5%
Regression based .........        1        547     2.1%    3.5%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA4AD          Numeric      Pos: (2) 998-998

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A4AD

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25224    97.8%   96.4%
Regression based .........        1        556     2.2%    3.6%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA4AE          Numeric      Pos: (2) 999-999

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A4AE

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25224    97.8%   96.4%
Regression based .........        1        556     2.2%    3.6%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA4AF          Numeric      Pos: (2) 1000-1000

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A4AF

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
     RESPONSE                 CODES       FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............        0      25226    97.9%   96.4%
Regression based .........        1        554     2.1%    3.6%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

Variable: MA5 Numeric Pos: (2) 1001-1001

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24368	94.5%	93.6%
Regression based	1	1412	5.5%	6.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA6 Numeric Pos: (2) 1002-1002

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24254	94.1%	93.0%
Regression based	1	1526	5.9%	7.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA7 Numeric Pos: (2) 1003-1003

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A7

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25567	99.2%	99.0%
Hot-deck	2	213	0.8%	1.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA7A Numeric Pos: (2) 1004-1004

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A7A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25268	98.0%	98.1%
Regression based	1	512	2.0%	1.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA8 Numeric Pos: (2) 1005-1005

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A8

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24791	96.2%	95.0%
Regression based	1	989	3.8%	5.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA9 Numeric Pos: (2) 1006-1006

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A9

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25637	99.4%	99.3%
Hot-deck	2	143	0.6%	0.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA10 Numeric Pos: (2) 1007-1007

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A10

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24006	93.1%	92.1%
Regression based	1	1774	6.9%	7.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA11_1 Numeric Pos: (2) 1008-1008

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A11_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24724	95.9%	96.3%
Regression based	1	1056	4.1%	3.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA11_2 Numeric Pos: (2) 1009-1009

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A11_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24724	95.9%	96.3%
Regression based	1	1056	4.1%	3.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MA11_3 Numeric Pos: (2) 1010-1010

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A11_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24724	95.9%	96.3%
Regression based	1	1056	4.1%	3.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MA11_4          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1011-1011

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A11_4

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24724     95.9%   96.3%
Regression based ..........       1     1056      4.1%    3.7%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA11_5          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1012-1012

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A11_5

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24724     95.9%   96.3%
Regression based ..........       1     1056      4.1%    3.7%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA11_6          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1013-1013

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A11_6

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24724     95.9%   96.3%
Regression based ..........       1     1056      4.1%    3.7%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA11_7          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1014-1014

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A11_7

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24724     95.9%   96.3%
Regression based ..........       1     1056      4.1%    3.7%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA12A           Numeric       Pos: (2) 1015-1015

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A12A

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    25618     99.4%   99.4%
Hot-deck ..................       2      162      0.6%    0.6%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MA13A           Numeric       Pos: (2) 1016-1016

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE A13A

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    25556     99.1%   99.2%
Hot-deck ..................       2      224      0.9%    0.8%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB14_1          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1017-1017

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B14_1

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24577     95.3%   94.7%
Regression based ..........       1     1203      4.7%    5.3%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB14_2          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1018-1018

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B14_2

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24577     95.3%   94.7%
Regression based ..........       1     1203      4.7%    5.3%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB14_3          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1019-1019

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B14_3

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24577     95.3%   94.7%
Regression based ..........       1     1203      4.7%    5.3%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MB14_4          Numeric       Pos: (2) 1020-1020

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B14_4

                                                  PER-   WGHTD
   RESPONSE                   CODES     FREQ      CENT   PCT

Not imputed ...............       0    24577     95.3%   94.7%
Regression based ..........       1     1203      4.7%    5.3%

TOTALS:                                25780    100.0%  100.0%
```

Variable: MB14_5 Numeric Pos: (2) 1021-1021

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B14_5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24577	95.3%	94.7%
Regression based	1	1203	4.7%	5.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB14_6 Numeric Pos: (2) 1022-1022

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B14_6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24577	95.3%	94.7%
Regression based	1	1203	4.7%	5.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_1 Numeric Pos: (2) 1023-1023

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_2 Numeric Pos: (2) 1024-1024

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 1-1

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_4 Numeric Pos: (3) 2-2

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_5 Numeric Pos: (3) 3-3

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_6 Numeric Pos: (3) 4-4

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_7 Numeric Pos: (3) 5-5

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_7

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_8 Numeric Pos: (3) 6-6

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_8

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_9 Numeric Pos: (3) 7-7

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_9

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB15_10 Numeric Pos: (3) 8-8

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B15_10

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24731	95.9%	95.2%
Regression based	1	1049	4.1%	4.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16A1 Numeric Pos: (3) 9-9

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25752	99.9%	99.9%
Regression based	1	28	0.1%	0.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16B1 Numeric Pos: (3) 10-10

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25514	99.0%	99.1%
Regression based	1	266	1.0%	0.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16C1 Numeric Pos: (3) 11-11

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16C1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25738	99.8%	99.8%
Hot-deck	2	42	0.2%	0.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16E1 Numeric Pos: (3) 12-12

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16E1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25403	98.5%	98.4%
Hot-deck	2	377	1.5%	1.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16A2 Numeric Pos: (3) 13-13

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25745	99.9%	99.9%
Regression based	1	35	0.1%	0.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16B2 Numeric Pos: (3) 14-14

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25648	99.5%	99.5%
Regression based	1	132	0.5%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16C2 Numeric Pos: (3) 15-15

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16C2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25697	99.7%	99.6%
Hot-deck	2	83	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16E2 Numeric Pos: (3) 16-16

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16E2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25491	98.9%	98.9%
Hot-deck	2	289	1.1%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 17-17

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25743	99.9%	99.9%
Regression based	1	37	0.1%	0.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 18-18

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25701	99.7%	99.7%
Regression based	1	79	0.3%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16C3 Numeric Pos: (3) 19-19

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16C3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25693	99.7%	99.7%
Hot-deck	2	87	0.3%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16E3 Numeric Pos: (3) 20-20

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16E3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25606	99.3%	99.4%
Hot-deck	2	174	0.7%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 21-21

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25753	99.9%	99.9%
Regression based	1	27	0.1%	0.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 22-22

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25752	99.9%	99.9%
Regression based	1	28	0.1%	0.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16C4 Numeric Pos: (3) 23-23

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16C4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25736	99.8%	99.9%
Hot-deck	2	44	0.2%	0.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB16E4 Numeric Pos: (3) 24-24

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B16E4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25706	99.7%	99.7%
Hot-deck	2	74	0.3%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB17 Numeric Pos: (3) 25-25

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B17

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25533	99.0%	99.1%
Regression based	1	247	1.0%	0.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB17A Numeric Pos: (3) 26-26

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B17A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25274	98.0%	97.9%
Regression based	1	506	2.0%	2.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB18 Numeric Pos: (3) 27-27

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25252	98.0%	97.9%
Hot-deck	2	528	2.0%	2.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB18A Numeric Pos: (3) 28-28

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25401	98.5%	98.5%
Regression based	1	379	1.5%	1.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB18B Numeric Pos: (3) 29-29

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25310	98.2%	98.0%
Hot-deck	2	470	1.8%	2.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB18C Numeric Pos: (3) 30-30

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B18C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25458	98.8%	98.8%
Regression based	1	322	1.2%	1.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19A1A Numeric Pos: (3) 31-31

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19A1A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25587	99.3%	99.2%
Regression based	1	193	0.7%	0.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19A1B Numeric Pos: (3) 32-32

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19A1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25598	99.3%	99.3%
Regression based	1	182	0.7%	0.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19A2 Numeric Pos: (3) 33-33

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25662	99.5%	99.5%
Hot-deck	2	118	0.5%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 34-34

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25329	98.3%	98.3%
Hot-deck	2	451	1.7%	1.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 35-35

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25453	98.7%	98.8%
Regression based	1	327	1.3%	1.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19B1A Numeric Pos: (3) 36-36

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19B1A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25671	99.6%	99.6%
Regression based	1	109	0.4%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19B1B Numeric Pos: (3) 37-37

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19B1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25676	99.6%	99.6%
Regression based	1	104	0.4%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19B2 Numeric Pos: (3) 38-38

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25681	99.6%	99.6%
Hot-deck	2	99	0.4%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 39-39

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25492	98.9%	98.9%
Hot-deck	2	288	1.1%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 40-40

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25495	98.9%	98.9%
Regression based	1	285	1.1%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19C1A Numeric Pos: (3) 41-41

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19C1A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25677	99.6%	99.6%
Regression based	1	103	0.4%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19C1B Numeric Pos: (3) 42-42

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19C1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25688	99.6%	99.6%
Regression based	1	92	0.4%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19C2 Numeric Pos: (3) 43-43

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19C2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25722	99.8%	99.8%
Hot-deck	2	58	0.2%	0.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19C3 Numeric Pos: (3) 44-44

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19C3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25619	99.4%	99.4%
Hot-deck	2	161	0.6%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB19C4 Numeric Pos: (3) 45-45

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B19C4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25628	99.4%	99.4%
Regression based	1	152	0.6%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A1 Numeric Pos: (3) 46-46

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25123	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	657	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A2 Numeric Pos: (3) 47-47

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25131	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	649	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 48-48

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25136	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	644	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 49-49

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25130	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	650	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A5 Numeric Pos: (3) 50-50

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25132	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	648	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A6 Numeric Pos: (3) 51-51

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25133	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	647	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A7 Numeric Pos: (3) 52-52

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A7

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25137	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	643	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A8 Numeric Pos: (3) 53-53

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A8

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25134	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	646	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A9 Numeric Pos: (3) 54-54

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A9

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25136	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	644	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A10 Numeric Pos: (3) 55-55

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A10

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25128	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	652	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A11 Numeric Pos: (3) 56-56

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A11

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25121	97.4%	97.1%
Regression based	1	659	2.6%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A12 Numeric Pos: (3) 57-57

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A12

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25131	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	649	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A13 Numeric Pos: (3) 58-58

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A13

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25133	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	647	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20A14 Numeric Pos: (3) 59-59

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20A14

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25135	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	645	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B1 Numeric Pos: (3) 60-60

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25074	97.3%	96.8%
Regression based	1	706	2.7%	3.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B2 Numeric Pos: (3) 61-61

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25081	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	699	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 62-62

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25087	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	693	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 63-63

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25084	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	696	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B5 Numeric Pos: (3) 64-64

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25081	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	699	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B6 Numeric Pos: (3) 65-65

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25081	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	699	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B7 Numeric Pos: (3) 66-66

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B7

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25085	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	695	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B8 Numeric Pos: (3) 67-67

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B8

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25082	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	698	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B9 Numeric Pos: (3) 68-68

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B9

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25084	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	696	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B10 Numeric Pos: (3) 69-69

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B10

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25078	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	702	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B11 Numeric Pos: (3) 70-70

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B11

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25076	97.3%	96.8%
Regression based	1	704	2.7%	3.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B12 Numeric Pos: (3) 71-71

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B12

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25083	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	697	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B13 Numeric Pos: (3) 72-72

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B13

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25083	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	697	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MB20B14 Numeric Pos: (3) 73-73

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE B20B14

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25084	97.3%	96.9%
Regression based	1	696	2.7%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21A1 Numeric Pos: (3) 74-74

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25050	97.2%	96.9%
Regression based	1	730	2.8%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21A2 Numeric Pos: (3) 75-75

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25059	97.2%	96.9%
Regression based	1	721	2.8%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 76-76

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER- CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25063	97.2%	96.9%
Regression based	1	717	2.8%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 77-77

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25059	97.2%	96.9%
Regression based	1	721	2.8%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21A5 Numeric Pos: (3) 78-78

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21A5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25058	97.2%	96.9%
Regression based	1	722	2.8%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21A6 Numeric Pos: (3) 79-79

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21A6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25055	97.2%	96.9%
Regression based	1	725	2.8%	3.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21B1 Numeric Pos: (3) 80-80

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24796	96.2%	95.8%
Regression based	1	984	3.8%	4.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21B2 Numeric Pos: (3) 81-81

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24815	96.3%	95.8%
Regression based	1	965	3.7%	4.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 82-82

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24814	96.3%	95.8%
Regression based	1	966	3.7%	4.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 83-83

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24814	96.3%	95.8%
Regression based	1	966	3.7%	4.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21B5 Numeric Pos: (3) 84-84

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21B5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24815	96.3%	95.8%
Regression based	1	965	3.7%	4.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC21B6 Numeric Pos: (3) 85-85

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C21B6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24815	96.3%	95.8%
Regression based	1	965	3.7%	4.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC22 Numeric Pos: (3) 86-86

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C22

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25468	98.8%	98.5%
Regression based	1	223	0.9%	1.1%
Hot-deck	2	89	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC22A Numeric Pos: (3) 87-87

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C22A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25739	99.8%	99.8%
Regression based	1	31	0.1%	0.2%
Hot-deck	2	10	0.0%	0.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A1B Numeric Pos: (3) 88-88

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25233	97.9%	97.8%
Hot-deck	2	547	2.1%	2.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A2A Numeric Pos: (3) 89-89

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A2A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25334	98.3%	98.2%
Regression based	1	446	1.7%	1.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A2B Numeric Pos: (3) 90-90

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A2B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25004	97.0%	96.2%
Regression based	1	776	3.0%	3.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A2C Numeric Pos: (3) 91-91

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A2C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25375	98.4%	98.3%
Regression based	1	405	1.6%	1.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A2D Numeric Pos: (3) 92-92

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A2D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25701	99.7%	99.6%
Regression based	1	79	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A2E Numeric Pos: (3) 93-93

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A2E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25639	99.5%	99.4%
Regression based	1	141	0.5%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A2F Numeric Pos: (3) 94-94

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A2F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25705	99.7%	99.6%
Regression based	1	75	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A2G Numeric Pos: (3) 95-95

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A2G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24454	94.9%	95.4%
Regression based	1	1326	5.1%	4.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 96-96

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25412	98.6%	98.4%
Regression based	1	368	1.4%	1.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 97-97

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23658	91.8%	91.9%
Hot-deck	2	2122	8.2%	8.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B1B Numeric Pos: (3) 98-98

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25410	98.6%	98.5%
Hot-deck	2	370	1.4%	1.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B2A Numeric Pos: (3) 99-99

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B2A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25447	98.7%	98.8%
Regression based	1	333	1.3%	1.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B2B Numeric Pos: (3) 100-100

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B2B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25331	98.3%	98.0%
Regression based	1	449	1.7%	2.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B2C Numeric Pos: (3) 101-101

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B2C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25460	98.8%	98.8%
Regression based	1	320	1.2%	1.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B2D Numeric Pos: (3) 102-102

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B2D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25714	99.7%	99.7%
Regression based	1	66	0.3%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B2E Numeric Pos: (3) 103-103

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B2E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25677	99.6%	99.5%
Regression based	1	103	0.4%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B2F Numeric Pos: (3) 104-104

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B2F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25716	99.8%	99.7%
Regression based	1	64	0.2%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B2G Numeric Pos: (3) 105-105

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B2G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24534	95.2%	96.0%
Regression based	1	1246	4.8%	4.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 106-106

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25518	99.0%	99.0%
Regression based	1	262	1.0%	1.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 107-107

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24273	94.2%	94.9%
Hot-deck	2	1507	5.8%	5.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C1B Numeric Pos: (3) 108-108

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25543	99.1%	99.1%
Hot-deck	2	237	0.9%	0.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C2A Numeric Pos: (3) 109-109

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C2A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25531	99.0%	99.1%
Regression based	1	249	1.0%	0.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C2B Numeric Pos: (3) 110-110

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C2B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25519	99.0%	98.8%
Regression based	1	261	1.0%	1.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C2C Numeric Pos: (3) 111-111

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C2C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25522	99.0%	99.0%
Regression based	1	258	1.0%	1.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C2D Numeric Pos: (3) 112-112

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C2D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25713	99.7%	99.7%
Regression based	1	67	0.3%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C2E Numeric Pos: (3) 113-113

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C2E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25678	99.6%	99.5%
Regression based	1	102	0.4%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C2F Numeric Pos: (3) 114-114

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C2F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25713	99.7%	99.7%
Regression based	1	67	0.3%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C2G Numeric Pos: (3) 115-115

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C2G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24709	95.8%	96.8%
Regression based	1	1071	4.2%	3.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C3 Numeric Pos: (3) 116-116

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25568	99.2%	99.2%
Regression based	1	212	0.8%	0.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23C4 Numeric Pos: (3) 117-117

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23C4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24780	96.1%	96.8%
Hot-deck	2	1000	3.9%	3.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D1B Numeric Pos: (3) 118-118

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25624	99.4%	99.4%
Hot-deck	2	156	0.6%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D2A Numeric Pos: (3) 119-119

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D2A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25594	99.3%	99.3%
Regression based	1	186	0.7%	0.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D2B Numeric Pos: (3) 120-120

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D2B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25604	99.3%	99.2%
Regression based	1	176	0.7%	0.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D2C Numeric Pos: (3) 121-121

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D2C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25568	99.2%	99.2%
Regression based	1	212	0.8%	0.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D2D Numeric Pos: (3) 122-122

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D2D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25708	99.7%	99.6%
Regression based	1	72	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D2E Numeric Pos: (3) 123-123

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D2E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25691	99.7%	99.5%
Regression based	1	89	0.3%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D2F Numeric Pos: (3) 124-124

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D2F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25708	99.7%	99.6%
Regression based	1	72	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D2G Numeric Pos: (3) 125-125

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D2G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25042	97.1%	97.8%
Regression based	1	738	2.9%	2.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D3 Numeric Pos: (3) 126-126

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25622	99.4%	99.4%
Regression based	1	158	0.6%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23D4 Numeric Pos: (3) 127-127

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23D4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25177	97.7%	98.2%
Hot-deck	2	603	2.3%	1.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E1B Numeric Pos: (3) 128-128

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E1B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25668	99.6%	99.5%
Hot-deck	2	112	0.4%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E2A Numeric Pos: (3) 129-129

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E2A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25644	99.5%	99.5%
Regression based	1	136	0.5%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E2B Numeric Pos: (3) 130-130

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E2B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25650	99.5%	99.4%
Regression based	1	130	0.5%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E2C Numeric Pos: (3) 131-131

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E2C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25641	99.5%	99.4%
Regression based	1	139	0.5%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E2D Numeric Pos: (3) 132-132

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E2D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25707	99.7%	99.6%
Regression based	1	73	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E2E Numeric Pos: (3) 133-133

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E2E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25692	99.7%	99.5%
Regression based	1	88	0.3%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E2F Numeric Pos: (3) 134-134

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E2F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25707	99.7%	99.6%
Regression based	1	73	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E2G Numeric Pos: (3) 135-135

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E2G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25391	98.5%	98.8%
Regression based	1	389	1.5%	1.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E3 Numeric Pos: (3) 136-136

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PERCENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25673	99.6%	99.5%
Regression based	1	107	0.4%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC23E4 Numeric Pos: (3) 137-137

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C23E4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25467	98.8%	98.9%
Hot-deck	2	313	1.2%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24 Numeric Pos: (3) 138-138

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24533	95.2%	94.5%
Regression based	1	1247	4.8%	5.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24A Numeric Pos: (3) 139-139

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25055	97.2%	97.1%
Regression based	1	725	2.8%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24B Numeric Pos: (3) 140-140

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25045	97.1%	97.1%
Regression based	1	735	2.9%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24C Numeric Pos: (3) 141-141

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25056	97.2%	97.1%
Regression based	1	724	2.8%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24D Numeric Pos: (3) 142-142

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25039	97.1%	97.0%
Regression based	1	741	2.9%	3.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24E Numeric Pos: (3) 143-143

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25060	97.2%	97.1%
Regression based	1	720	2.8%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24F Numeric Pos: (3) 144-144

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25050	97.2%	97.1%
Regression based	1	730	2.8%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24G Numeric Pos: (3) 145-145

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25050	97.2%	97.1%
Regression based	1	730	2.8%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24H Numeric Pos: (3) 146-146

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25049	97.2%	97.1%
Regression based	1	731	2.8%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24I Numeric Pos: (3) 147-147

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25037	97.1%	97.0%
Regression based	1	743	2.9%	3.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24J Numeric Pos: (3) 148-148

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25034	97.1%	97.0%
Regression based	1	746	2.9%	3.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC24K Numeric Pos: (3) 149-149

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C24K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25042	97.1%	97.1%
Regression based	1	738	2.9%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25A1 Numeric Pos: (3) 150-150

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	21052	81.7%	79.9%
Regression based	1	4728	18.3%	20.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25A2 Numeric Pos: (3) 151-151

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20606	79.9%	78.1%
Regression based	1	5174	20.1%	21.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 152-152

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20595	79.9%	78.0%
Regression based	1	5185	20.1%	22.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 153-153

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20538	79.7%	78.0%
Regression based	1	5242	20.3%	22.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25B1 Numeric Pos: (3) 154-154

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20470	79.4%	77.7%
Regression based	1	5310	20.6%	22.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25B2 Numeric Pos: (3) 155-155

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20180	78.3%	76.6%
Regression based	1	5600	21.7%	23.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 156-156

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20284	78.7%	76.7%
Regression based	1	5496	21.3%	23.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC25B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 157-157

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C25B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20448	79.3%	77.5%
Regression based	1	5332	20.7%	22.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC26 Numeric Pos: (3) 158-158

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C26

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ.	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24461	94.9%	93.9%
Regression based	1	1319	5.1%	6.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC27 Numeric Pos: (3) 159-159

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C27

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24189	93.8%	92.9%
Regression based	1	1591	6.2%	7.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC28 Numeric Pos: (3) 160-160

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C28

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25723	99.8%	99.7%
Regression based	1	57	0.2%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC29 Numeric Pos: (3) 161-161

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C29

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25203	97.8%	97.9%
Hot-deck	2	577	2.2%	2.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC30 Numeric Pos: (3) 162-162

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C30

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25505	98.9%	98.9%
Regression based	1	275	1.1%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC31 Numeric Pos: (3) 163-163

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C31

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	16163	62.7%	65.2%
Regression based	1	9617	37.3%	34.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC32 Numeric Pos: (3) 164-164

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C32

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	15211	59.0%	61.4%
Regression based	1	10569	41.0%	38.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33A1 Numeric Pos: (3) 165-165

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25199	97.7%	97.3%
Regression based	1	581	2.3%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33B1 Numeric Pos: (3) 166-166

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25206	97.8%	97.6%
Regression based	1	574	2.2%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C1_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 167-167

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C1_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25187	97.7%	97.6%
Regression based	1	593	2.3%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C1_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 168-168

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C1_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25187	97.7%	97.6%
Regression based	1	593	2.3%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C1_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 169-169

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C1_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25187	97.7%	97.6%
Regression based	1	593	2.3%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33D1 Numeric Pos: (3) 170-170

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33D1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25178	97.7%	97.4%
Regression based	1	602	2.3%	2.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E1_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 171-171

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E1_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25204	97.8%	97.5%
Regression based	1	576	2.2%	2.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E1_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 172-172

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E1_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25204	97.8%	97.5%
Regression based	1	576	2.2%	2.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E1_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 173-173

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E1_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25204	97.8%	97.5%
Regression based	1	576	2.2%	2.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33A2 Numeric Pos: (3) 174-174

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25196	97.7%	97.3%
Regression based	1	584	2.3%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33B2 Numeric Pos: (3) 175-175

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25219	97.8%	97.7%
Regression based	1	561	2.2%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C2_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 176-176

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C2_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25215	97.8%	97.7%
Regression based	1	565	2.2%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Variable: MC33C2_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 177-177

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C2_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25215	97.8%	97.7%
Regression based	1	565	2.2%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C2_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 178-178

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C2_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25215	97.8%	97.7%
Regression based	1	565	2.2%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33D2 Numeric Pos: (3) 179-179

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33D2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25185	97.7%	97.4%
Regression based	1	595	2.3%	2.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E2_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 180-180

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E2_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25215	97.8%	97.6%
Regression based	1	565	2.2%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E2_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 181-181

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E2_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25215	97.8%	97.6%
Regression based	1	565	2.2%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E2_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 182-182

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E2_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25215	97.8%	97.6%
Regression based	1	565	2.2%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 183-183

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25196	97.7%	97.3%
Regression based	1	584	2.3%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 184-184

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25250	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	530	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C3_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 185-185

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C3_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25244	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	536	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C3_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 186-186

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C3_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25244	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	536	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C3_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 187-187

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C3_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25244	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	536	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33D3 Numeric Pos: (3) 188-188

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33D3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25220	97.8%	97.5%
Regression based	1	560	2.2%	2.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E3_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 189-189

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E3_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25233	97.9%	97.6%
Regression based	1	547	2.1%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E3_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 190-190

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E3_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25233	97.9%	97.6%
Regression based	1	547	2.1%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E3_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 191-191

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E3_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25233	97.9%	97.6%
Regression based	1	547	2.1%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 192-192

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25196	97.7%	97.3%
Regression based	1	584	2.3%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 193-193

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25242	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	538	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C4_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 194-194

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C4_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25233	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	547	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C4_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 195-195

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C4_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25233	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	547	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C4_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 196-196

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C4_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25233	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	547	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33D4 Numeric Pos: (3) 197-197

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33D4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25239	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	541	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E4_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 198-198

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E4_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25246	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	534	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E4_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 199-199

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E4_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25246	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	534	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E4_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 200-200

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E4_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25246	97.9%	97.7%
Regression based	1	534	2.1%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33A5 Numeric Pos: (3) 201-201

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33A5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25195	97.7%	97.3%
Regression based	1	585	2.3%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33B5 Numeric Pos: (3) 202-202

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33B5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25184	97.7%	97.4%
Regression based	1	596	2.3%	2.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C5_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 203-203

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C5_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25214	97.8%	97.6%
Regression based	1	566	2.2%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C5_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 204-204

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C5_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25214	97.8%	97.6%
Regression based	1	566	2.2%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C5_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 205-205

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C5_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25214	97.8%	97.6%
Regression based	1	566	2.2%	2.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33D5 Numeric Pos: (3) 206-206

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33D5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25148	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	632	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E5_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 207-207

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E5_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25201	97.8%	97.4%
Regression based	1	579	2.2%	2.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E5_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 208-208

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E5_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25201	97.8%	97.4%
Regression based	1	579	2.2%	2.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E5_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 209-209

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E5_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25201	97.8%	97.4%
Regression based	1	579	2.2%	2.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33A6 Numeric Pos: (3) 210-210

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33A6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25193	97.7%	97.3%
Regression based	1	587	2.3%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33B6 Numeric Pos: (3) 211-211

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33B6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25261	98.0%	97.8%
Regression based	1	519	2.0%	2.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C6_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 212-212

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C6_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25267	98.0%	97.8%
Regression based	1	513	2.0%	2.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C6_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 213-213

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C6_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25267	98.0%	97.8%
Regression based	1	513	2.0%	2.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33C6_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 214-214

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33C6_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25267	98.0%	97.8%
Regression based	1	513	2.0%	2.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33D6 Numeric Pos: (3) 215-215

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33D6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25273	98.0%	97.9%
Regression based	1	507	2.0%	2.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E6_1 Numeric Pos: (3) 216-216

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E6_1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25279	98.1%	97.9%
Regression based	1	501	1.9%	2.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E6_2 Numeric Pos: (3) 217-217

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E6_2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25279	98.1%	97.9%
Regression based	1	501	1.9%	2.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC33E6_3 Numeric Pos: (3) 218-218

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C33E6_3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25279	98.1%	97.9%
Regression based	1	501	1.9%	2.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34A Numeric Pos: (3) 219-219

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23912	92.8%	91.6%
Regression based	1	1868	7.2%	8.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34B Numeric Pos: (3) 220-220

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24003	93.1%	91.9%
Regression based	1	1777	6.9%	8.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34C Numeric Pos: (3) 221-221

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24007	93.1%	91.8%
Regression based	1	1773	6.9%	8.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34D Numeric Pos: (3) 222-222

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24310	94.3%	93.0%
Regression based	1	1470	5.7%	7.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34E Numeric Pos: (3) 223-223

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23804	92.3%	91.0%
Regression based	1	1976	7.7%	9.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34F Numeric Pos: (3) 224-224

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23407	90.8%	89.4%
Regression based	1	2373	9.2%	10.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34G Numeric Pos: (3) 225-225

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24325	94.4%	93.0%
Regression based	1	1455	5.6%	7.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34H Numeric Pos: (3) 226-226

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24480	95.0%	93.8%
Regression based	1	1300	5.0%	6.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34I Numeric Pos: (3) 227-227

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24477	94.9%	93.7%
Regression based	1	1303	5.1%	6.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34J Numeric Pos: (3) 228-228

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23434	90.9%	89.6%
Regression based	1	2346	9.1%	10.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34K Numeric Pos: (3) 229-229

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24462	94.9%	93.7%
Regression based	1	1318	5.1%	6.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC34L Numeric Pos: (3) 230-230

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C34L

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24371	94.5%	93.3%
Regression based	1	1409	5.5%	6.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35A1 Numeric Pos: (3) 231-231

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35A1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	19415	75.3%	71.3%
Regression based	1	1276	4.9%	6.3%
Dont know imputd	3	5089	19.7%	22.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35A2 Numeric Pos: (3) 232-232

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35A2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	21483	83.3%	78.8%
Regression based	1	1293	5.0%	6.4%
Dont know imputd	3	3004	11.7%	14.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35A3 Numeric Pos: (3) 233-233

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35A3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22315	86.6%	82.4%
Regression based	1	1293	5.0%	6.3%
Dont know imputd	3	2172	8.4%	11.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35A4 Numeric Pos: (3) 234-234

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35A4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20719	80.4%	76.5%
Regression based	1	1299	5.0%	6.4%
Dont know imputd	3	3762	14.6%	17.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35A5 Numeric Pos: (3) 235-235

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35A5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	17632	68.4%	65.9%
Regression based	1	1302	5.1%	6.4%
Dont know imputd	3	6846	26.6%	27.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35A6 Numeric Pos: (3) 236-236

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35A6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20892	81.0%	77.3%
Regression based	1	1300	5.0%	6.4%
Dont know imputd	3	3588	13.9%	16.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35B1 Numeric Pos: (3) 237-237

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35B1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25240	97.9%	97.5%
Regression based	1	540	2.1%	2.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35B2 Numeric Pos: (3) 238-238

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35B2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25199	97.7%	97.2%
Regression based	1	581	2.3%	2.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35B3 Numeric Pos: (3) 239-239

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35B3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25118	97.4%	97.0%
Regression based	1	662	2.6%	3.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35B4 Numeric Pos: (3) 240-240

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35B4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25139	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	641	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35B5 Numeric Pos: (3) 241-241

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35B5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25229	97.9%	97.3%
Regression based	1	551	2.1%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35B6 Numeric Pos: (3) 242-242

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35B6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25161	97.6%	97.1%
Regression based	1	619	2.4%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35C1 Numeric Pos: (3) 243-243

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35C1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25256	98.0%	97.5%
Regression based	1	524	2.0%	2.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35C2 Numeric Pos: (3) 244-244

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35C2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25162	97.6%	97.1%
Regression based	1	618	2.4%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35C3 Numeric Pos: (3) 245-245

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35C3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25034	97.1%	96.8%
Regression based	1	746	2.9%	3.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35C4 Numeric Pos: (3) 246-246

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35C4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25052	97.2%	96.8%
Regression based	1	728	2.8%	3.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35C5 Numeric Pos: (3) 247-247

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35C5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25231	97.9%	97.3%
Regression based	1	549	2.1%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC35C6 Numeric Pos: (3) 248-248

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C35C6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25146	97.5%	97.1%
Regression based	1	634	2.5%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC36A Numeric Pos: (3) 249-249

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C36A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25026	97.1%	97.1%
Regression based	1	754	2.9%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC36B Numeric Pos: (3) 250-250

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C36B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25037	97.1%	97.1%
Regression based	1	743	2.9%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC36C Numeric Pos: (3) 251-251

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C36C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25059	97.2%	97.2%
Regression based	1	721	2.8%	2.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC36D Numeric Pos: (3) 252-252

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C36D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25050	97.2%	97.1%
Regression based	1	730	2.8%	2.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC37AA Numeric Pos: (3) 253-253

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37AA

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24916	96.6%	96.5%
Regression based	1	864	3.4%	3.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC37AB Numeric Pos: (3) 254-254

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37AB

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24921	96.7%	96.6%
Regression based	1	859	3.3%	3.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MC37AC Numeric Pos: (3) 255-255

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37AC

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24922	96.7%	96.6%
Regression based	1	858	3.3%	3.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

```
Variable: MC37AD          Numeric        Pos: (3) 256-256

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37AD

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     24923    96.7%   96.6%
Regression based .........         1       857     3.3%    3.4%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37AE          Numeric        Pos: (3) 257-257

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37AE

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     24922    96.7%   96.6%
Regression based .........         1       858     3.3%    3.4%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37AF          Numeric        Pos: (3) 258-258

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37AF

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     24912    96.6%   96.6%
Regression based .........         1       868     3.4%    3.4%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37BA          Numeric        Pos: (3) 259-259

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37BA

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     23060    89.4%   89.1%
Regression based .........         1      2720    10.6%   10.9%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37BB          Numeric        Pos: (3) 260-260

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37BB

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     23058    89.4%   89.1%
Regression based .........         1      2722    10.6%   10.9%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37BC          Numeric        Pos: (3) 261-261

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37BC

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     23055    89.4%   89.0%
Regression based .........         1      2725    10.6%   11.0%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37BD          Numeric        Pos: (3) 262-262

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37BD

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     23062    89.5%   89.1%
Regression based .........         1      2718    10.5%   10.9%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37BE          Numeric        Pos: (3) 263-263

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37BE

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     23055    89.4%   89.0%
Regression based .........         1      2725    10.6%   11.0%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC37BF          Numeric        Pos: (3) 264-264

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C37BF

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     23060    89.4%   89.1%
Regression based .........         1      2720    10.6%   10.9%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

```
Variable: MC38            Numeric        Pos: (3) 265-265

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE C38

                                                   PER-   WGHTD
      RESPONSE                 CODES      FREQ     CENT    PCT

Not imputed ..............         0     23187    89.9%   86.6%
Hot-deck .................         2      2593    10.1%   13.4%

TOTALS:                                  25780   100.0%  100.0%
```

Variable: MD39A Numeric Pos: (3) 266-266

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D39A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24663	95.7%	94.8%
Regression based	1	1117	4.3%	5.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD39B Numeric Pos: (3) 267-267

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D39B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24484	95.0%	93.9%
Regression based	1	1296	5.0%	6.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD39C Numeric Pos: (3) 268-268

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D39C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24567	95.3%	94.2%
Regression based	1	1213	4.7%	5.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD39D Numeric Pos: (3) 269-269

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D39D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24475	94.9%	93.8%
Regression based	1	1305	5.1%	6.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD39E Numeric Pos: (3) 270-270

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D39E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24099	93.5%	92.1%
Regression based	1	1681	6.5%	7.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD39F Numeric Pos: (3) 271-271

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D39F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	21740	84.3%	85.3%
Regression based	1	4040	15.7%	14.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40A Numeric Pos: (3) 272-272

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24353	94.5%	92.8%
Regression based	1	1427	5.5%	7.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40B Numeric Pos: (3) 273-273

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23951	92.9%	90.6%
Regression based	1	1829	7.1%	9.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40C Numeric Pos: (3) 274-274

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22261	86.3%	83.4%
Regression based	1	3519	13.7%	16.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40D Numeric Pos: (3) 275-275

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23604	91.6%	88.7%
Regression based	1	2176	8.4%	11.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40E Numeric Pos: (3) 276-276

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20634	80.0%	78.7%
Regression based	1	5146	20.0%	21.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40F Numeric Pos: (3) 277-277

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24335	94.4%	92.5%
Regression based	1	1445	5.6%	7.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40G Numeric Pos: (3) 278-278

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22854	88.7%	84.5%
Regression based	1	2926	11.3%	15.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40H Numeric Pos: (3) 279-279

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	18582	72.1%	70.0%
Regression based	1	7198	27.9%	30.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD40I Numeric Pos: (3) 280-280

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D40I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25081	97.3%	96.5%
Regression based	1	699	2.7%	3.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD41A Numeric Pos: (3) 281-281

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D41A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23627	91.6%	91.3%
Regression based	1	2153	8.4%	8.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD41B Numeric Pos: (3) 282-282

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D41B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24106	93.5%	92.8%
Regression based	1	1674	6.5%	7.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD41C Numeric Pos: (3) 283-283

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D41C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23422	90.9%	90.5%
Regression based	1	2358	9.1%	9.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD41D Numeric Pos: (3) 284-284

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D41D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23608	91.6%	91.1%
Regression based	1	2172	8.4%	8.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD41E Numeric Pos: (3) 285-285

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D41E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23886	92.7%	92.2%
Regression based	1	1894	7.3%	7.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD42 Numeric Pos: (3) 286-286

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D42

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25260	98.0%	97.7%
Regression based	1	520	2.0%	2.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43A Numeric Pos: (3) 287-287

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24889	96.5%	95.7%
Regression based	1	891	3.5%	4.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43B Numeric Pos: (3) 288-288

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24590	95.4%	94.4%
Regression based	1	1190	4.6%	5.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43C Numeric Pos: (3) 289-289

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24833	96.3%	95.4%
Regression based	1	947	3.7%	4.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43D Numeric Pos: (3) 290-290

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24703	95.8%	94.9%
Regression based	1	1077	4.2%	5.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43E Numeric Pos: (3) 291-291

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24845	96.4%	95.5%
Regression based	1	935	3.6%	4.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43F Numeric Pos: (3) 292-292

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24499	95.0%	94.1%
Regression based	1	1281	5.0%	5.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43G Numeric Pos: (3) 293-293

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24517	95.1%	94.1%
Regression based	1	1263	4.9%	5.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43H Numeric Pos: (3) 294-294

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24645	95.6%	94.7%
Regression based	1	1135	4.4%	5.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43I Numeric Pos: (3) 295-295

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22841	88.6%	88.1%
Regression based	1	2939	11.4%	11.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43J Numeric Pos: (3) 296-296

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24744	96.0%	95.1%
Regression based	1	1036	4.0%	4.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43K Numeric Pos: (3) 297-297

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22400	86.9%	86.5%
Regression based	1	3380	13.1%	13.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43L Numeric Pos: (3) 298-298

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43L

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24524	95.1%	94.4%
Regression based	1	1256	4.9%	5.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43M Numeric Pos: (3) 299-299

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43M

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24496	95.0%	94.1%
Regression based	1	1284	5.0%	5.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD43N Numeric Pos: (3) 300-300

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D43N

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24601	95.4%	94.5%
Regression based	1	1179	4.6%	5.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD44 Numeric Pos: (3) 301-301

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D44

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24996	97.0%	96.1%
Regression based	1	784	3.0%	3.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD45 Numeric Pos: (3) 302-302

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D45

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24443	94.8%	92.9%
Regression based	1	1337	5.2%	7.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MD46 Numeric Pos: (3) 303-303

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE D46

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25161	97.6%	97.3%
Regression based	1	619	2.4%	2.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47A Numeric Pos: (3) 304-304

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23393	90.7%	89.3%
Regression based	1	2387	9.3%	10.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47B Numeric Pos: (3) 305-305

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	21163	82.1%	79.1%
Regression based	1	4617	17.9%	20.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47C Numeric Pos: (3) 306-306

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23534	91.3%	89.9%
Regression based	1	2246	8.7%	10.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47D Numeric Pos: (3) 307-307

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23561	91.4%	90.0%
Regression based	1	2219	8.6%	10.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47E Numeric Pos: (3) 308-308

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23581	91.5%	90.1%
Regression based	1	2199	8.5%	9.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47F Numeric Pos: (3) 309-309

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23575	91.4%	90.1%
Regression based	1	2205	8.6%	9.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47G Numeric Pos: (3) 310-310

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23556	91.4%	89.9%
Regression based	1	2224	8.6%	10.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47H Numeric Pos: (3) 311-311

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23568	91.4%	90.0%
Regression based	1	2212	8.6%	10.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47I Numeric Pos: (3) 312-312

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23560	91.4%	90.0%
Regression based	1	2220	8.6%	10.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47J Numeric Pos: (3) 313-313

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47J

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23564	91.4%	90.0%
Regression based	1	2216	8.6%	10.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47K Numeric Pos: (3) 314-314

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47K

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23567	91.4%	90.0%
Regression based	1	2213	8.6%	10.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47L Numeric Pos: (3) 315-315

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47L

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23560	91.4%	89.9%
Regression based	1	2220	8.6%	10.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47M Numeric Pos: (3) 316-316

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47M

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23562	91.4%	89.9%
Regression based	1	2218	8.6%	10.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47N Numeric Pos: (3) 317-317

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47N

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23554	91.4%	89.9%
Regression based	1	2226	8.6%	10.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47O Numeric Pos: (3) 318-318

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47O

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23574	91.4%	90.0%
Regression based	1	2206	8.6%	10.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P1 Numeric Pos: (3) 319-319

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P1

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P2 Numeric Pos: (3) 320-320

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P2

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P3 Numeric Pos: (3) 321-321

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P3

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P4 Numeric Pos: (3) 322-322

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P4

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P5 Numeric Pos: (3) 323-323

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P5

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P6 Numeric Pos: (3) 324-324

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P6

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P7 Numeric Pos: (3) 325-325

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P7

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P8 Numeric Pos: (3) 326-326

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P8

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23338	90.5%	88.9%
Regression based	1	2442	9.5%	11.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME47P9 Numeric Pos: (3) 327-327

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E47P9

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23782	92.2%	91.1%
Regression based	1	1998	7.8%	8.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME48 Numeric Pos: (3) 328-328

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E48

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24763	96.1%	95.6%
Regression based	1	1017	3.9%	4.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME49 Numeric Pos: (3) 329-329

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E49

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22352	86.7%	85.2%
Regression based	1	3428	13.3%	14.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: ME50 Numeric Pos: (3) 330-330

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE E50

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24535	95.2%	94.8%
Regression based	1	1245	4.8%	5.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF51 Numeric Pos: (3) 331-331

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F51

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25770	100.0%	100.0%
Regression based	1	10	0.0%	0.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF52A Numeric Pos: (3) 332-332

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F52A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25522	99.0%	99.0%
Regression based	1	258	1.0%	1.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF52B Numeric Pos: (3) 333-333

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F52B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25503	98.9%	98.9%
Regression based	1	277	1.1%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF53A Numeric Pos: (3) 334-334

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F53A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25692	99.7%	99.6%
Hot-deck	2	88	0.3%	0.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF53AA Numeric Pos: (3) 335-335

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F53AA

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25717	99.8%	99.7%
Hot-deck	2	63	0.2%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF54 Numeric Pos: (3) 336-336

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F54

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25717	99.8%	99.7%
Regression based	1	63	0.2%	0.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF54AA Numeric Pos: (3) 337-337

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F54AA

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25758	99.9%	100.0%
Hot-deck	2	22	0.1%	0.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF55 Numeric Pos: (3) 338-338

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F55

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25183	97.7%	97.8%
Hot-deck	2	597	2.3%	2.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF56A Numeric Pos: (3) 339-339

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F56A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25323	98.2%	98.2%
Regression based	1	457	1.8%	1.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF56C Numeric Pos: (3) 340-340

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F56C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25497	98.9%	98.9%
Hot-deck	2	283	1.1%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF57A Numeric Pos: (3) 341-341

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F57A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25632	99.4%	99.4%
Regression based	1	148	0.6%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF57C Numeric Pos: (3) 342-342

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F57C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	25647	99.5%	99.4%
Hot-deck	2	133	0.5%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF58A Numeric Pos: (3) 343-343

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F58A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24099	93.5%	92.4%
Regression based	1	1681	6.5%	7.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF58B Numeric Pos: (3) 344-344

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F58B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24053	93.3%	92.1%
Regression based	1	1727	6.7%	7.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF59A Numeric Pos: (3) 345-345

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F59A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24251	94.1%	92.6%
Regression based	1	1529	5.9%	7.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF59B Numeric Pos: (3) 346-346

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F59B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24125	93.6%	92.1%
Regression based	1	1655	6.4%	7.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF59C Numeric Pos: (3) 347-347

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F59C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22668	87.9%	84.9%
Regression based	1	3112	12.1%	15.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF59D Numeric Pos: (3) 348-348

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F59D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23043	89.4%	86.7%
Regression based	1	2737	10.6%	13.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF59E Numeric Pos: (3) 349-349

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F59E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23595	91.5%	89.1%
Regression based	1	2185	8.5%	10.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF59F Numeric Pos: (3) 350-350

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F59F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23097	89.6%	87.0%
Regression based	1	2683	10.4%	13.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF59G Numeric Pos: (3) 351-351

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F59G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24782	96.1%	94.6%
Regression based	1	998	3.9%	5.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60A Numeric Pos: (3) 352-352

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24181	93.8%	92.4%
Regression based	1	1599	6.2%	7.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60B Numeric Pos: (3) 353-353

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24061	93.3%	92.0%
Regression based	1	1719	6.7%	8.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60C Numeric Pos: (3) 354-354

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24183	93.8%	92.4%
Regression based	1	1597	6.2%	7.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60D Numeric Pos: (3) 355-355

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24275	94.2%	92.7%
Regression based	1	1505	5.8%	7.3%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60E Numeric Pos: (3) 356-356

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24131	93.6%	92.0%
Regression based	1	1649	6.4%	8.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60F Numeric Pos: (3) 357-357

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24158	93.7%	92.1%
Regression based	1	1622	6.3%	7.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60G Numeric Pos: (3) 358-358

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24765	96.1%	95.3%
Regression based	1	1015	3.9%	4.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60H Numeric Pos: (3) 359-359

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24283	94.2%	92.8%
Regression based	1	1497	5.8%	7.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MF60I Numeric Pos: (3) 360-360

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE F60I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	24365	94.5%	94.4%
Regression based	1	1415	5.5%	5.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YD42 Numeric Pos: (3) 361-362

SURVEY VARIABLE D42 WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
	25	8	0.0%	0.0%
	26	4	0.0%	0.1%
	27	8	0.0%	0.0%
	28	13	0.1%	0.0%
	29	12	0.0%	0.1%
	30	29	0.1%	0.1%
	31	35	0.1%	0.1%
	32	32	0.1%	0.1%
	33	46	0.2%	0.2%
	34	22	0.1%	0.1%
	35	69	0.3%	0.4%
	36	25	0.1%	0.1%
	37	32	0.1%	0.1%
	38	26	0.1%	0.1%
	39	32	0.1%	0.2%
	40	137	0.5%	0.6%
	41	26	0.1%	0.1%
	42	54	0.2%	0.2%
	43	40	0.2%	0.2%
	44	28	0.1%	0.1%
	45	175	0.7%	0.8%
	46	50	0.2%	0.2%
	47	50	0.2%	0.2%
	48	56	0.2%	0.2%
	49	39	0.2%	0.1%
	50	451	1.7%	1.8%
	51	87	0.3%	0.3%
	52	118	0.5%	0.4%
	53	103	0.4%	0.4%
	54	138	0.5%	0.5%
	55	1331	5.2%	4.5%
	56	304	1.2%	1.1%
	57	335	1.3%	1.2%
	58	473	1.8%	1.7%
	59	384	1.5%	1.4%
	60	2716	10.5%	10.2%
	61	463	1.8%	1.8%
	62	1738	6.7%	6.2%
	63	627	2.4%	2.4%
	64	553	2.1%	2.2%
	65	5932	23.0%	22.7%
	66	763	3.0%	3.0%
	67	894	3.5%	3.4%
	68	974	3.8%	3.8%
	69	648	2.5%	2.7%
	70	3009	11.7%	12.2%
	71	360	1.4%	1.4%
	72	448	1.7%	1.9%
	73	334	1.3%	1.3%
	74	281	1.1%	1.1%
	75	479	1.9%	2.2%
	76	106	0.4%	0.4%
	77	84	0.3%	0.4%
	78	87	0.3%	0.5%
	79	67	0.3%	0.3%
	80	155	0.6%	0.7%
	81	29	0.1%	0.1%
	82	23	0.1%	0.1%
	83	21	0.1%	0.1%
	84	20	0.1%	0.1%
	85	38	0.1%	0.1%
	86	8	0.0%	0.0%
	87	5	0.0%	0.0%
	88	6	0.0%	0.0%
	89	3	0.0%	0.0%
	90	43	0.2%	0.2%
	91	5	0.0%	0.0%

YD42 (Continued)

	92	7	0.0%	0.0%
	93	8	0.0%	0.0%
	94	4	0.0%	0.0%
	95	18	0.1%	0.1%
	96	3	0.0%	0.0%
	97	6	0.0%	0.0%
	98	4	0.0%	0.0%
	99	39	0.2%	0.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YD44 Numeric Pos: (3) 363-364

SURVEY VARIABLE D44 WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
	1	17227	66.8%	68.9%
	2	8553	33.2%	31.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YD45 Numeric Pos: (3) 365-366

SURVEY VARIABLE D45 WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
	1	11535	44.7%	42.2%
	2	14245	55.3%	57.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YD46 Numeric Pos: (3) 367-368

SURVEY VARIABLE D46 WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
	25	1	0.0%	0.0%
	27	1	0.0%	0.0%
	28	1	0.0%	0.0%
	29	1	0.0%	0.0%
	32	3	0.0%	0.0%
	34	2	0.0%	0.0%
	35	4	0.0%	0.0%
	37	1	0.0%	0.0%
	38	3	0.0%	0.0%
	39	3	0.0%	0.0%
	40	9	0.0%	0.0%
	42	2	0.0%	0.0%
	43	3	0.0%	0.0%
	44	2	0.0%	0.0%
	45	29	0.1%	0.1%
	46	6	0.0%	0.0%
	47	5	0.0%	0.0%
	48	13	0.1%	0.0%
	49	2	0.0%	0.0%
	50	194	0.8%	0.7%
	51	32	0.1%	0.1%
	52	65	0.3%	0.2%
	53	48	0.2%	0.2%
	54	58	0.2%	0.2%
	55	829	3.2%	3.0%
	56	142	0.6%	0.5%
	57	202	0.8%	0.7%
	58	298	1.2%	1.0%
	59	270	1.0%	1.1%
	60	2277	8.8%	8.7%
	61	327	1.3%	1.2%
	62	1471	5.7%	5.4%
	63	493	1.9%	1.8%
	64	464	1.8%	1.7%
	65	6015	23.3%	22.9%
	66	674	2.6%	2.6%
	67	840	3.3%	3.1%
	68	1000	3.9%	4.1%
	69	702	2.7%	2.7%
	70	4193	16.3%	16.6%
	71	517	2.0%	2.0%
	72	622	2.4%	2.5%
	73	478	1.9%	1.7%
	74	423	1.6%	1.7%
	75	1092	4.2%	4.8%
	76	206	0.8%	0.8%
	77	182	0.7%	0.7%
	78	168	0.7%	0.6%
	79	147	0.6%	0.5%
	80	408	1.6%	1.9%
	81	72	0.3%	0.3%
	82	70	0.3%	0.3%
	83	68	0.3%	0.3%
	84	45	0.2%	0.2%
	85	114	0.4%	0.5%
	86	31	0.1%	0.1%
	87	18	0.1%	0.1%
	88	24	0.1%	0.1%
	89	16	0.1%	0.1%
	90	109	0.4%	0.5%
	91	18	0.1%	0.1%
	92	15	0.1%	0.1%
	93	22	0.1%	0.2%
	94	16	0.1%	0.1%
	95	52	0.2%	0.2%
	96	11	0.0%	0.1%
	97	21	0.1%	0.1%
	98	21	0.1%	0.1%
	99	109	0.4%	0.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF58A Numeric Pos: (3) 369-370

SURVEY VARIABLE F58A WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
less than h.s.	1	6022	23.4%	21.4%
H.S. diploma	2	9095	35.3%	36.2%
Some college	3	3473	13.5%	13.4%
Associate degree	4	1150	4.5%	4.5%
Bachelors degree	5	3617	14.0%	14.7%
Masters degree	6	1687	6.5%	7.0%
Phd/ professional	7	401	1.6%	1.6%
Other	8	335	1.3%	1.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF58B Numeric Pos: (3) 371-372

SURVEY VARIABLE F58B WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
less than h.s.	1	6997	27.1%	25.4%
H.S. diploma	2	6599	25.6%	25.8%
Some college	3	3090	12.0%	11.8%
Associate degree	4	615	2.4%	2.3%
Bachelors degree	5	3663	14.2%	15.2%
Masters degree	6	1982	7.7%	7.8%
Phd/ professional	7	2582	10.0%	10.8%
Other	8	252	1.0%	0.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60A Numeric Pos: (3) 373-374

SURVEY VARIABLE F60A WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	8040	31.2%	29.9%
Stayed the same	2	10412	40.4%	41.4%
Improved	3	7328	28.4%	28.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60B Numeric Pos: (3) 375-376

SURVEY VARIABLE F60B WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	7247	28.1%	29.5%
Stayed the same	2	12795	49.6%	48.8%
Improved	3	5738	22.3%	21.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60C Numeric Pos: (3) 377-378

SURVEY VARIABLE F60C WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	3549	13.8%	13.8%
Stayed the same	2	12889	50.0%	50.0%
Improved	3	9342	36.2%	36.1%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60D Numeric Pos: (3) 379-380

SURVEY VARIABLE F60D WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	5072	19.7%	19.8%
Stayed the same	2	8562	33.2%	34.7%
Improved	3	12146	47.1%	45.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60E Numeric Pos: (3) 381-382

SURVEY VARIABLE F60E WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	10711	41.5%	43.5%
Stayed the same	2	9186	35.6%	34.8%
Improved	3	5883	22.8%	21.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60F Numeric Pos: (3) 383-384

SURVEY VARIABLE F60F WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	12876	49.9%	49.8%
Stayed the same	2	10407	40.4%	40.6%
Improved	3	2497	9.7%	9.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60G Numeric Pos: (3) 385-386

SURVEY VARIABLE F60G WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	4071	15.8%	16.2%
Stayed the same	2	11089	43.0%	44.1%
Improved	3	10620	41.2%	39.7%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60H Numeric Pos: (3) 387-388

SURVEY VARIABLE F60H WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	3950	15.3%	14.7%
Stayed the same	2	14559	56.5%	56.9%
Improved	3	7271	28.2%	28.4%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: YF60I Numeric Pos: (3) 389-390

SURVEY VARIABLE F60I WITH DK IMPUTED

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Worsened	1	2562	9.9%	9.4%
Stayed the same	2	14259	55.3%	54.0%
Improved	3	8959	34.8%	36.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYD42 Numeric Pos: (3) 391-391

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YD42

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	17147	66.5%	64.7%
Regression based	1	520	2.0%	2.3%
Dont know imputd	3	8113	31.5%	33.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYD44 Numeric Pos: (3) 392-392

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YD44

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	18489	71.7%	71.5%
Regression based	1	784	3.0%	3.9%
Dont know imputd	3	6507	25.2%	24.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYD45 Numeric Pos: (3) 393-393

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YD45

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	15067	58.4%	57.0%
Regression based	1	1337	5.2%	7.1%
Dont know imputd	3	9376	36.4%	35.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYD46 Numeric Pos: (3) 394-394

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YD46

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	16754	65.0%	65.3%
Regression based	1	619	2.4%	2.7%
Dont know imputd	3	8407	32.6%	32.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF58A Numeric Pos: (3) 395-395

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF58A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23946	92.9%	91.8%
Regression based	1	1681	6.5%	7.6%
Dont know imputd	3	153	0.6%	0.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF58B Numeric Pos: (3) 396-396

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF58B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	23800	92.3%	91.2%
Regression based	1	1727	6.7%	7.9%
Dont know imputd	3	253	1.0%	0.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60A Numeric Pos: (3) 397-397

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60A

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20672	80.2%	77.5%
Regression based	1	1599	6.2%	7.6%
Dont know imputd	3	3509	13.6%	14.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60B Numeric Pos: (3) 398-398

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60B

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	19046	73.9%	70.8%
Regression based	1	1719	6.7%	8.0%
Dont know imputd	3	5015	19.5%	21.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60C Numeric Pos: (3) 399-399

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60C

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20111	78.0%	76.2%
Regression based	1	1597	6.2%	7.6%
Dont know imputd	3	4072	15.8%	16.2%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60D Numeric Pos: (3) 400-400

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60D

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	22128	85.8%	82.8%
Regression based	1	1505	5.8%	7.3%
Dont know imputd	3	2147	8.3%	9.9%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60E Numeric Pos: (3) 401-401

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60E

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	16685	64.7%	61.0%
Regression based	1	1649	6.4%	8.0%
Dont know imputd	3	7446	28.9%	31.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60F Numeric Pos: (3) 402-402

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60F

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	20196	78.3%	73.3%
Regression based	1	1622	6.3%	7.9%
Dont know imputd	3	3962	15.4%	18.8%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60G Numeric Pos: (3) 403-403

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60G

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	21547	83.6%	79.7%
Regression based	1	1015	3.9%	4.7%
Dont know imputd	3	3218	12.5%	15.6%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60H Numeric Pos: (3) 404-404

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60H

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	21636	83.9%	80.8%
Regression based	1	1497	5.8%	7.2%
Dont know imputd	3	2647	10.3%	12.0%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Variable: MYF60I	Numeric	Pos: (3) 405-405

IMPUTATION FLAG FOR VARIABLE YF60I

RESPONSE	CODES	FREQ	PER-CENT	WGHTD PCT
Not imputed	0	16732	64.9%	63.9%
Regression based	1	1415	5.5%	5.6%
Dont know imputd	3	7633	29.6%	30.5%
TOTALS:		25780	100.0%	100.0%

Appendix Q

NSOPF-1993 National Technical Review Panel (NTRP) Members

NATIONAL STUDY OF POSTSECONDARY FACULTY-1993: NATIONAL TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL

Nonfederal Members (outside Washington area)

Tommy Annas
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research
State University of New York Central Administration
State University Plaza
Albany, NY 12246

Roger Baldwin
College of William and Mary
School of Education
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

Jay L. Chronister, Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Eric L. Dey
The University of Michigan
2117d School of Education
610 E. University
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Martin Finkelstein, Professor
Higher Education Administration Program
N.J.I.C.T.L.
Seton Hall University
South Orange, NJ 07079

Carol S. Hollins
Coordinator
Institutional Research
John Tyler Community College
Chester, VA 23831

David Leslie, Chairman
Department of Educational Leadership
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Michael Nettles
University of Michigan
2035 School of Education Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-1611

Terrence Russell
Executive Director
Association for Institutional Research
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-3038

Jack Schuster, Professor
Higher Education Program
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, CA 91711-6160

Mary Jean Whitelaw
Director of Data Management
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Princeton, NJ 08540

Holly Zanzille
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Susan Campbell Hall
University of Oregon Campus
Eugene, OR 97403-1075

Nonfederal Members (Washington area)

Ernst Benjamin
General Secretary
American Association of University Professors
Washington, DC 20005

Elaine El-Khawas
Vice President for Policy Analysis and Research
American Council on Education
Washington, DC 20036

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Alan Fechter
Executive Director
Office of Scientific and Engineering Personnel
National Research Council
Washington, DC 20418

Jon Fuller
National Institute of Independent
Colleges and Universities
Washington, DC 20001-2190

Frederick Jacobs
Dean of the Faculties
The American University
Washington, DC 20016

Enid Jones
Director of Research
American Association of Community Colleges
Washington, DC 20036

Meredith Ludwig
Director, Association Research
American Association of State Colleges and
Universities
Washington, DC 20036

Christine Maitland
Organization Specialist
Membership and Affiliates
National Education Association
Washington, DC 20036

Ted Marchese
Vice President
American Association for Higher Education
Washington, DC 20036

James Palmer
Assistant Professor
5900 Department of Educational
Administration and Foundation
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61790-5900

Federal Members

Mary Golladay
Director of Science and Engineering
Education and Human Resources Group
National Science Foundation
Arlington VA 22230

Larry Suter
Program Director
Studies and Indicators Program
National Science Foundation
Arlington, VA 22230

Sally Kirkgasler, Director
Office of Policy Development
Office of Postsecondary Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202

Jeff Thomas
Assistant Director for Humanities Studies
Office of Planning and Budget
National Endowment for the Humanities
Washington, DC 20506

Greg Henschel
Postsecondary Education Divison
Office of the Undersecretary
Washington, DC 20202

Appendix R

Technical Report:

Discrepancies in Faculty Estimates in the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty

TECHNICAL REPORT:
Discrepancies in Faculty Estimates in the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty

Submitted to:
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208

Submitted by:
National Opinion Research Center (NORC)
University of Chicago
1155 E. 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Table of Contents

Chapter I. Background and Scope of the Problem 1
- 1.1 Comparing NSOPF-93 with NSOPF-88 Faculty Estimates 5
- 1.2 NSOPF-93 Procedures and Discrepancies 8

Chapter II. Discrepancy and Trend Analysis 13
- 2.1 Discrepancy Analysis 13
- 2.2 Trend Analysis: 1987 and 1992 20

Chapter III. Retrieval, Verification, and Reconciliation 23
- 3.1 Identifying Institutions for Retrieval and Reconciliation 23
- 3.2 Review of Hard Copy Lists 23
- 3.3 Telephone Follow-up for Retrieval and Reconciliation 24
- 3.4 Results of the Retrieval and Reconciliation Effort 27
- 3.5 Results of Reconciliation at Institutions Employing Health Sciences Faculty 29
- 3.6 Reestimating Faculty Population Based on the Reconciliation Effort 32

Chapter IV. Sampling, Weighting, and Imputation in NSOPF-93 43
- 4.1 Independent Review of Sampling, Weighting, and Imputation 43
- 4.2 Problem Identification 43
- 4.3 Part-Time Faculty 43
  - 4.3.1 Response Rates 44
  - 4.3.2 Survey Implementation and the Part-Time Nonresponse Problem 46
  - 4.3.3 The Exclusion of Subsampled Faculty 47
- 4.4 Health Sciences Faculty 49
- 4.5 Imputation Procedures 51

Chapter V. Adjustments for NSOPF-93 and Recommendations for Future Cycles 53
- 5.1 Adjustments for NSOPF-93 53
  - 5.1.1 Recalculating the Nonresponse Weighting Adjustment 53
  - 5.1.2 Poststratification Adjustments 53
  - 5.1.3 Health Sciences Faculty 53
- 5.2 Recommendations for the Next NSOPF Cycle 54
  - 5.2.1 Changing Time Frames and Starting List Collection Later 54
  - 5.2.2 Providing Institutions with an Information Sheet 55
  - 5.2.3 Coordinating Institution Questionnaire Mailing and List Collection 55
  - 5.2.4 Changes to Questionnaire Instructions and Questions 56
- 5.3 Health Sciences Faculty and the Faculty Questionnaire 57

Executive Summary

Exploratory research with the NSOPF-88 datasets and the original 1993 NSOPF weighted faculty and institution datasets indicated several trends that contradicted expectations: (1) a shortfall in the estimated number of part-time faculty compared to the estimate from the NSOPF-88 datasets; (2) a decline of 37.3 percent of health sciences faculty from 1987; and (3) a substantial gap in total faculty estimates between the NSOPF-93 list (sampling frame) and faculty counts reported by administrators on the institution questionnaire. An investigation of these findings began in December 1995.

Scope of the investigation. The investigation consisted of four parts: (1) a comparison of institutions that fell into both NSOPF samples; (2) an analysis of discrepancies between three sets of NSOPF-93 faculty estimates: the list enumerations the institution supplied for sampling purposes, hereafter referred to as LIST; those reported on the institution questionnaire (hereafter referred to as the QUEX); and those provided by NCES's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (hereafter referred to as IPEDS); (3) a data retrieval, verification, and reconciliation effort involving the recontact of 509 of the 817 NSOPF-93 participating institutions; (4) an independent review of the sampling, weighting, and imputation procedures used for the NSOPF-93.

Comparison of 1987 and 1992 samples. One hundred eighty-five institutions, representing 43.6 percent of the institutions responding to the 1987 institution questionnaire (185/424 respondents) and 21.2 percent of the institutions responding to the 1992 institution questionnaire (185/872), provided complete data in each survey. A comparison of these 185 institutions showed that part-time faculty increased over the five-year span by 16.7 percent. In the 49 institutions which operated medical schools or hospitals, the number of faculty in all employment status categories increased between 1987 and 1992. Although the findings of this subset of schools are not generalizable to all schools in the sample, these trends contradicted the findings based on the full NSOPF-93 sample.

Discrepancy and trends analysis. To identify systematic sources of discrepancies in faculty estimates between LIST and QUEX data sources, the analysis compared discrepancies between different types of institutions. The investigation found that LIST estimates tended to exceed QUEX estimates in large institutions, in institutions with medical components, and in private schools. QUEX estimates tended to be higher in smaller institutions, in institutions without medical components, and in public schools. Institutions supplied much higher QUEX estimates for part-time faculty than LIST estimates. Faculty lists submitted early in the list collection process showed little difference in the magnitude of QUEX/LIST discrepancies than faculty lists submitted later in the process. The only statistically significant discrepancy was noted in smaller institutions, where the institution questionnaire faculty count exceeded the count supplied on the faculty sampling list.

Retrieval, verification and reconciliation. In January and February 1996, a retrieval, verification, and reconciliation effort was undertaken. It involved recontacting 509 institutions, including 450 institutions whose reported total faculty estimate on the QUEX differed from the estimate supplied on the institution's LIST by 10 percent or more, and an additional 59 institutions NCES designated as operating medical schools or hospitals. All institutions employing health sciences faculty (n=120) participating in either the NSOPF-93 faculty survey or the NSOPF-93 institution survey were selected into the recontact sample. NORC staff received responses from 492 (96.6 percent) of the 509 institutions. Institution respondents identified the QUEX as being more accurate in 280 instances (56.9 percent), and the LIST as being more accurate for 122 (24.8 percent). Fifty-six institutions (11.4 percent) confirmed neither estimate and provided a new estimate, and 5 (1 percent) of the schools chose IPEDS as the most accurate estimate. An additional 29 institutions (5.9 percent) could not verify any particular estimate and therefore the original LIST estimate was retained.

Review of sampling, weighting and imputation. An independent review found no errors in the sampling, weighting or imputation procedures used in NSOPF-93 for the original faculty dataset. In fact, faculty employment status (part-time/full-time) and primary area of teaching (i.e., where "health sciences" is designated) were imputed so rarely that no significant bias could have resulted. However, this review found a major cause for the shortfall in part-time faculty numbers: nonresponse. The reviewer was unfortunately limited in his examination of the health sciences faculty numbers because primary teaching area was not recorded for nonresponding faculty.

Recommendations. Several statistical adjustments to remedy existing problems in NSOPF-93 estimates were implemented. The first of these was the recalculation of the nonresponse weighting adjustment to correct for the known deficiency in the estimate of part-time faculty. Nonresponse adjustment did not, however, address the gap in faculty estimates between the QUEX and LIST totals. To remedy this problem, a poststratification adjustment using the "best estimate" identified during the retrieval, verification, and reconciliation effort was implemented. Several recommendations on survey design are proposed for field-testing in the next round of NSOPF.

Chapter I. Background and Scope of the Problem

In exploratory research using the original NSOPF-93 faculty dataset, the NSOPF staff at the National Opinion Research Center and its subcontractor, the Pelavin Research Institute, produced faculty estimates that diverged from expectations, in some cases significantly. Gaps appeared between the total number of faculty recorded on the faculty list (or sampling frame) and numbers of faculty institution administrators reported on the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire. Discrepancies were also apparent in the estimates of faculty in the health sciences—although they appeared across other faculty disciplines as well—and in estimates of part-time faculty.

In the health sciences, population estimates of the total number of faculty showed a decline of 48,095 (or 37.3 percent) from estimates produced for NSOPF-88. These changes are displayed in Exhibit 1-1, which compares totals for the nine health sciences disciplines. These observations may have indicated a possible problem in the 1987-88 NSOPF dataset. The difficulty of obtaining and rechecking sampling and weighting data files prepared for the 1987 survey prevented further exploration of that dataset. A check with the Association of American Medical Colleges and other health sciences professional organizations cast doubt on the accuracy of the NSOPF-93 data. Data from these external sources suggested that the health sciences faculties had not declined sharply between 1987 and 1992. While the AAMC definitions of faculty do not match NSOPF definitions exactly, the 1994 *AAMC Data Book* reported that paid faculty (both full-time and part-time) in pre-clinical and clinical sciences in U.S. medical schools increased from 75,156 in 1987-88 to 94,641 in 1992-93. While the possibility of a problem in NSOPF-88 cannot be ruled out, the fact that external sources did not verify a substantial decline in health sciences faculty populations between 1987 and 1992 suggested that it was more prudent to focus the investigation on the original NSOPF-93 dataset.

Exhibit 1-2 compares weighted national faculty population estimates from two NSOPF-93 sources. It illustrates the weighted faculty estimates provided by institutions that supplied only a faculty sampling list (*n*=57), institutions which completed only the institution questionnaire.(*n*=112) and institutions which supplied both a faculty sampling list and an institution questionnaire (*n*=760). Weights in the original faculty dataset summed to 899,765. This compared to a faculty population estimate of 1,035,055 derived from the institution questionnaire.

This discrepancy is well illustrated in the comparison between the 760 institutions for which both faculty-level data and institution-level data were available. For these institutions, weights in the original faculty dataset summed to 820,716. This number fell short of the total number of faculty reported on the institution questionnaire by 106,855. Part-time faculty accounted for the bulk of this shortfall (83,408 or 78 percent of the total shortfall). Since different sources were involved (i.e. faculty lists and institution questionnaires), it was reasonable to assume that the estimates would be different. However, discrepancies of these magnitudes were a reason for concern.

Both of these findings seemed counterintuitive, proceeding in the opposite direction of NCES's expectations. Some statistical and anecdotal evidence on higher education for the period in question (1987 to 1992) predicted an increase, rather than a decrease, in part-time faculty.

Tables 1 to 3 in the Attachment to this report illustrate changes in faculty totals between 1987 and 1992 reported in three different databases: the NSOPF institution survey, the NSOPF faculty survey and the National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). Several trends are apparent in these tables: 1) that NSOPF-88 and the original NSOPF-93 survey reported higher totals for faculty on the institution survey than on the faculty survey, and that faculty population estimates from both NSOPF-93 surveys exceeded those reported in the 1993 IPEDS; 2) that the original faculty dataset for NSOPF-93 indicated a full-time/part-time faculty breakdown of instructional faculty of 66.9 percent (full-time) to 33.1 percent (part-time), compared with the 57.6 percent (full-time) to 42.4 percent (part-time) breakdown for instructional faculty reported on the NSOPF-93 institutional questionnaire; and 3) that IPEDS and the NSOPF-93 institution survey recorded a growth in the percentage of part-time faculty between 1987 and 1992, while the NSOPF-93 faculty survey showed virtually no change in the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty.

Exhibit 1-1. Changes in health sciences faculty between NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93

Principal Fields	NSOPF-88 faculty dataset			NSOPF-93 original faculty dataset			Differences between 1992 and 1987			
	Total #	Pct. full-time	Pct. part-time	Total #	Pct. full-time	Pct. part-time	Difference	Pct. change total	Pct. change full-time	Pct. change part-time
Health technology	8,904	56.6	43.4	10,101	64.2	35.8	1,197	13.4	28.7	-6.5
Dentistry	9,403	46.0	54.0	5,684	57.9	42.1	-3,719	-39.6	-23	-53
Health svc. admin.	1,295	61.8	38.2	1,137	49.9	50.1	-158	-12.2	-29	-15.3
Medicine/psychiatry	52,865	83.4	16.6	19,136	80.3	19.7	-33,729	-63.8	-65	-57
Nursing	25,902	74.7	26.3	25,573	77.0	23.0	-329	-1.3	3.2	-13.7
Pharmacy	3958	72.4	27.6	2,215	78.3	21.7	-1,743	-44	-39	-56.1
Public health	7,301	63.7	36.3	2,554	77.3	22.7	-4,747	-65	-57	-78.1
Veterinary medicine	2816	97.9	2.1	1,994	85.2	14.8	-822	-29.2	-38	394.8
Other health sciences	16,567	61.1	38.9	12,522	68.9	31.1	-4,045	-24.4	-14	-39.5
ALL HEALTH SCIENCES	129,011	72.7	27.3	80,916	73.5	26.5	-48,095	-37.3	-36	-39.1

Exhibit 1-2. Comparison of NSOPF-93 faculty counts

TOTAL FACULTY	*n*	Sum of original faculty weights (*n* = 817)	Weighted inst. quex count (*n* = 872)	Difference (total & pct.) (LIST-QUEX)/LIST
TOTAL		899,765	1,035,055	-135,290 (-15.0%)
List, No Quex	57	79,048	--	--
List & Quex	760	820,716	927,571	-106,855 (-13.0%)
Quex, No list	112	--	107,483	--

TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY	*n*	Sum of original faculty weights (*n* = 817)	Weighted inst. quex count (*n* = 872)	Difference (total & pct.) (LIST-QUEX)/LIST
TOTAL		595,340	615,191	-19,852 (-3.3%)
List, No Quex	57	61,530	--	--
List & Quex	760	533,810	557,257	-23,447 (-4.4%)
Quex, No list	112	--	57,935	--

TOTAL PART-TIME FACULTY	*n*	Sum of original faculty weights (*n* = 817)	Weighted inst. quex count (*n* = 872)	Difference (total & pct.) (LIST-QUEX)/LIST
TOTAL		304,426	419,864	-115,438 (-37.9%)
List, No Quex	57	17,519	--	--
List & Quex	760	286,907	370,315	-83,408 (-29.1%)
Quex, No list	112	--	49,549	--

1.1 Comparing NSOPF-93 with NSOPF-88 Faculty Estimates

To take a closer look at trends in faculty estimates, institution questionnaire data for full-time and part-time faculty reported from institutions which participated in the NSOPF-88 and the NSOPF-93 institution survey was compared. One hundred ninety-seven institutions, representing 46.5 percent of the institutions responding to the 1987 questionnaire (197/424 respondents) and 22.6 percent of the institutions responding to the 1992 questionnaire (197/872), appeared in both surveys. Only institutions that provided complete data for total, full-time and part-time faculty for both 1987 and 1992 questionnaires were included in the comparisons. For this reason, no more than 185 of the 197 institutions could be compared. In addition, because of the special concern with the enumeration of health sciences faculty, the trends in faculty data were compared for institutions NCES designated as including a medical center or hospital. Forty-nine institutions so designated supplied complete data in both years. Totals for the numbers of faculty reported on 1987 and 1992 "matched" institution questionnaires are presented in Exhibits 1-3 and 1-4.

Exhibit 1-3. Data for institutions participating in NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93

Totals reported	Number of matched institutions	1987	1992	Percent change, 1987-92 (standard error)
Full-time faculty	185	110,495	113,104	2.4 (2.9)
Part-time faculty	185	49,493	57,764	16.7 (9.5)
Total faculty	185	159,988	170,868	6.8* (2.9)

*Significant at .05. Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Exhibit 1-4. Data for NSOPF Medical Schools and Hospitals Only

Totals reported	Number of matched institutions	1987	1992	Percent change, 1987-92 (standard error)
Full-time faculty	49	60,575	61,389	1.3 (5.1)
Part-time faculty	49	20,441	23,757	16.2 (20.3)
Total faculty	49	81,016	85,146	5.1 (4.6)

This analysis provided two important pieces of information. First, the trends suggested run counter to the trends in the weighted data based on the original faculty lists. That is, more full-time and part-time faculty were reported in 1992 than in 1987 for this limited subset of institutions. The comparison of matched institutions also confirmed expectations that totals for medical faculty *did not decline* from 1987 to 1992, and that part-time faculty in both the medical and non-medical sectors showed noticeable increases. In fact, as the tables above show, trends in the subset of NSOPF institutions with hospitals and medical schools were virtually identical to the trends noted in the sample of NSOPF institutions which participated in both NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93.

Exhibits 1-5 to 1-7, which divide the institutions into their institutional strata, demonstrate which types of institutions contributed disproportionately to the increase in full-time and part-time faculty. For instance, the public two-year institutions that appeared in the 1987 and 1992 surveys showed *sizable and statistically significant increases* in part-time faculty, with the number of part-time faculty increasing 38 percent and the total number of faculty increasing 28 percent. Public research institutions also showed a large (52.8 percent), although not statistically significant, increase in the number of part-time faculty employed between 1987 and 1992. Private doctoral institutions which completed institution questionnaires in both NSOPF rounds were the only type of institution to show declines in both full-time and part-time faculty from 1987 to 1992. However, as there are only 12 of these institutions in the entire subset of institutions, it is inadvisable to draw any conclusions about the statistical significance of this change.

Exhibit 1-5. Changes in matched institutions, 1987 to 1992
TOTAL FACULTY (unweighted data)

Stratum	*n*	1987 faculty count	1992 faculty count	Mean percent change (standard error)
Public research	32	56,466	59,965	6.2 (4.2)
Private research	13	24,602	25,404	3.3 (10.9)
Public doctoral	36	29,023	32,518	12.0* (4.4)
Private doctoral	12	9,566	7,879	-17.6* (7.1)
Public comprehensive	30	17,518	17,767	1.4 (7.4)
Private comprehensive	12	5,135	4,806	-6.4 (9.3)
Private liberal arts	6	920	1,183	28.6* (14.7)
Public two-year	35	14,838	18,920	27.5 (10.5)
Other	9	1,920	2,426	26.4 (31.7)

*Significant at .05. Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Exhibit 1-6. Changes in matched institutions, 1987 to 1992
FULL-TIME FACULTY (unweighted data)

Stratum	*n*	1987 faculty count	1992 faculty count	Mean percent change (standard error)
Public research	32	47,462	46,203	-2.7 (5.9)
Private research	13	13,930	15,632	12.2* (3.7)
Public doctoral	36	22,300	24,595	10.3* (3.4)
Private doctoral	12	5,058	4,353	-13.9 (11.9)
Public comprehensive	30	11,841	11,673	-1.4 (4.7)
Private comprehensive	12	2,470	2,530	2.4 (8.1)
Private liberal arts	6	720	849	17.9 (10.3)
Public two-year	35	5,520	6,032	9.3 (6.4)
Other	9	1,194	1,237	3.6 (7.7)

*Significant at .05. Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Exhibit 1-7. Changes in matched institutions, 1987 to 1992
PART-TIME FACULTY (unweighted data)

Stratum	*n*	1987 faculty count	1992 faculty count	Mean percent change (standard error)
Public research	32	9,004	13,762	52.8 (34.4)
Private research	13	10,672	9,772	-8.4 (22.0)
Public doctoral	36	6,723	7,923	17.8 (11.6)
Private doctoral	12	4,508	3,526	-21.8* (7.8)
Public comprehensive	30	5,677	6,094	7.3 (16.8)
Private comprehensive	12	2,665	2,276	-14.6 (16.3)
Private liberal arts	6	200	334	67.0* (30.7)
Public two-year	35	9,318	12,888	38.3* (14.6)
Other	9	726	1,189	63.8 (76.7)

*Significant at .05. Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

1.2 NSOPF-93 Procedures and Discrepancies

For NSOPF-93, the discrepancies might have indicated problems in the way sampled institutions enumerated their faculty during the October 1992-July 1993 list collection. During list collection, the faculty enumerations reported on lists from each participating institution were checked against 1991-92 IPEDS data for the same institution. In general, the faculty lists enumerated more faculty members than IPEDS, a factor which is illustrated in Exhibit 1-8. Moreover, paired t-tests comparing list and IPEDS counts (not shown) for total faculty and for significant subgroups of faculty (e.g. men and women, white and non-white faculty) indicated that the faculty sampling lists consistently accounted for a higher number of faculty than IPEDS. This pattern was expected and also occurred in NSOPF-88. The definition of faculty for NSOPF-93 was broader and more inclusive than the IPEDS definition and therefore, should have included a larger number of faculty. Exhibit 1-9 presents a comparison of the NSOPF and IPEDS definitions.

Exhibit 1-8. NSOPF counts of total faculty (unweighted) by source and year

(Faculty list/IPEDS) comparison	**Matched observations of faculty counts**	
LIST	232,618 ($n=410$)	490,935 ($n=718$)
IPEDS	231,376 ($n=410$)	419,903 ($n=718$)
(Institution questionnaire/list) comparison		
Questionnaire	236,121 ($n=410$)	495,235 ($n=760$)
LIST	232,618 ($n=410$)	477,692 ($n=760$)
(Institution questionnaire/IPEDS) comparison		
Questionnaire	236,121 ($n=410$)	484,611 ($n=746$)
IPEDS	231,376 ($n=410$)	405,636 ($n=746$)

Exhibit 1-9. Definitions of faculty used in NSOPF-93 and IPEDS

National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Faculty Universe (NSOPF-93)	**NCES Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)**
Unlike NSOPF-88, which was limited to faculty whose regular assignment included instruction, the faculty universe for NSOPF-93 was expanded to include anyone who was designated as faculty, whether or not their responsibilities included instruction, as well as other (non-faculty) personnel with instructional responsibilities. Under this definition, researchers and administrators and other institutional staff who hold faculty positions, but who do not instruct, would be included in the sample. Instructional staff without faculty status would also be in the sample, but teaching assistants would not be included. **Eligibility criteria for faculty.** The eligible universe of postsecondary faculty was defined as individuals who were: • full- and part-time personnel whose regular assignment includes instruction • full- and part-time faculty whose regular assignment includes only research • permanent and temporary personnel who have any instructional duties, including those who have adjunct, acting, or visiting status • faculty and instructional personnel on sabbatical leave • administrators who have faculty status Excluded from the NSOPF-93 universe of faculty were: • faculty and other personnel with instructional duties outside the U.S. (but not faculty or sabbatical leave) • temporary replacements for faculty and other instructional personnel • faculty and other instructional and non-instructional personnel on leave without pay • graduate teaching assistants • military personnel who teach only ROTC courses • instructional personnel supplied by independent contractors	**Faculty eligibility criteria.** The eligible universe of postsecondary faculty was defined as those members of the Instruction/Research staff who are reported on the IPEDS Fall Staff Survey. The following excerpt from the Fall Staff Survey Summary (OERI Form 27) describes eligible faculty: ". . . all persons whose specific assignments customarily are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, or public service as a principal activity (or activities) and who hold academic-rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, or the equivalent of any of these academic ranks. If their principal activity is instructional, report in this category deans, directors, or the equivalent, as well as associate deans, assistant deans, and executive officers of academic departments (chairpersons, heads, or the equivalent). Do not include student teachers or research assistants . . ."

The time gap between list collection and questionnaire completion for NSOPF-93 also appeared likely to introduce additional variability in reporting faculty enumerations. Lists were submitted between October 1992 and July 1993, and the institution survey was conducted between September 1993 and May 1994. The NSOPF-93 data collection therefore encompassed a 20-month period. For NSOPF-88, the data collection period extended from December 1987 to October 1988 (10 months). Though Exhibit 1-8 shows that faculty counts were higher on the questionnaire than on the list for both NSOPF years, the difference was much greater than anticipated for NSOPF-93.

Institutional Coordinators—individuals designated by each institution to supply lists of faculty for sampling purposes—may have neglected to include medical school and part-time faculty on their institutions' lists. This seemed a plausible explanation as anecdotal evidence suggested that several major institutions had "spun off" medical centers and hospitals from their main campuses. In addition, the often-tenuous institutional status of part-time faculty members at most institutions suggested a greater likelihood that institution reports of part-time faculty might, for various reasons, be incomplete even after these estimates were verified against the previous year's IPEDS estimates for NSOPF-93. Those completing the institution questionnaires—fewer than one-half (385/872 or 44.2 percent) of whom were the same individuals who oversaw preparation of their institution's faculty list—may have inadvertently omitted part-timers and medical or hospital-affiliated faculty in reporting their faculty enumerations on the institution questionnaire.

Chapter II. Discrepancy and Trend Analysis

The investigation of original NSOPF-93 dataset consisted of three parts: (1) an analysis of discrepancies between three sets of estimates: the faculty list enumerations the institution supplied for sampling purposes (hereafter referred to as **LIST**); faculty estimates reported on the institution questionnaire (hereafter referred to as **QUEX**); and NCES's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (hereafter referred to as **IPEDS**); (2) a data retrieval, verification, and reconciliation effort involving the recontact of NSOPF-93 participating institutions with LIST/QUEX discrepancies of 10 percent or more and all participating institutions with a medical school or hospital; and (3) a review of the sampling, weighting, and imputation procedures used for the 1992-93 NSOPF. This chapter reports on the discrepancies, Chapter 3 reports on reconciliation and verification effort, and Chapter 4 reports on the review of sampling, weighting and imputation procedures.

Of a target sample of 974 postsecondary institutions, 962 (99 percent) were eligible for inclusion in the NSOPF-93 sample. Of the 962 eligible institutions, 817 (85 percent) institutions agreed to participate in the NSOPF-93 full-scale study. "Participation" was defined as providing an enumeration of faculty that could be used for sampling purposes. A total of 872 (91 percent) of the 962 eligible institutions responded by completing an institution questionnaire. Thus, the 509 institutions recontacted for the retrieval and reconciliation effort represented 62.3 percent of the 817 participating institutions and 58.4 percent of 872 institutions that completed an institution questionnaire.

2.1 Discrepancy Analysis

Discrepancies in faculty estimates from the three sources (LIST, QUEX, and IPEDS) were inevitable, owing to the varying definitions used and the different data systems postsecondary institutions maintain to account for faculty. To identify systematic patterns of discrepancies in faculty estimates between institution questionnaire data and other data sources, a number of institutional characteristics were considered. These were: size (smaller or larger than the median), control (public or private), type (two-year versus four-year), and stratum. Medical and non-medical institutions were also compared.

Institution Size. Institutions were divided into "small" and "large" at the median faculty count for institutions in each of the three comparison sets. For the LIST/IPEDS comparison, institutions were divided at the median IPEDS faculty count of 352. For the QUEX/LIST comparison, institutions were divided at the median LIST count of 363 faculty members. And for the QUEX/IPEDS comparison, institutions were divided at the median IPEDS faculty count of 321 faculty members. Paired t-tests comparing mean discrepancies and mean percent discrepancies are reported in Exhibits 2-1 and 2-2.

The significant differences found in five of the six LIST/IPEDS comparisons underscore a point made earlier: that the NSOPF-93 faculty list, which used a more expansive definition of faculty members than the IPEDS dataset, consistently accounted for a greater number of faculty members than IPEDS. In the QUEX/LIST comparison, the only significant difference noted occurred in smaller institutions, where the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire consistently enumerated an average of 68 faculty members more than the faculty list. Expressed in percentage terms, institution questionnaire faculty counts tended to report an average of 39 percent more faculty members than did the sampling lists these institutions submitted. For the most part, the QUEX/IPEDS comparison mirrors the LIST/IPEDS comparison. This reflects the general pattern of observations: QUEX faculty counts tend to exceed LIST faculty counts, which, in turn, tend to exceed IPEDS faculty counts. The difference in definitions of faculty members used in both QUEX and LIST and the definition used in IPEDS reinforces this pattern.

Type and Control. In general, it was found that institution type (two-year or four-year) and institution control (public or private) were not significant factors in explaining discrepancies in faculty counts between the original faculty list and the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire.

Exhibit 2-1. Discrepancies by institution characteristics: size, type and control
Mean differences (matched pairs)

Comparison	LIST - IPEDS		QUEX - LIST		QUEX-IPEDS	
Institution characteristic	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**
SIZE						
Small	360	59.7* (8.2)	382	68.3* (12.1)	374	77.0* (8.8)
Large	358	138.4* (42.0)	378	-22.6 (31.3)	372	134.9* (39.2)
CONTROL						
Public	500	101.8* (17.4)	529	38.2 (22.4)	520	130.9* (18.6)
Private	218	92.4 (58.2)	231	-11.5 (20.7)	226	48.2 (50.4)
TYPE						
Two-year	225	62.2* (18.7)	267	40.9 (23.2)	250	100.0* (24.4)
Four-year	493	115.7* (29.9)	493	13.4 (22.7)	496	108.8* (27.5)

*Significant at .05.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Exhibit 2-2. Discrepancies by institution characteristics: Size, type and control
Percent Differences (Paired t-tests)

Comparison	LIST - IPEDS		QUEX - LIST		QUEX - IPEDS	
Institution characteristic	*n*	**Percent difference (standard error)****	*n*	**Percent difference (standard error)****	*n*	**Percent difference (standard error)****
SIZE						
Small	360	34.6* (4.8)	382	38.8* (6.9)	374	47.4* (5.6)
Large	358	13.8* (4.5)	378	-2.1 (2.9)	389	14.5* (4.6)
CONTROL						
Public	500	16.2* (2.9)	529	5.6 (3.4)	520	22.2* (3.3)
Private	218	18.9 (13.2)	231	-2.3 (4.0)	226	10.9 (12.5)
TYPE						
Two-year	225	17.3* (5.6)	267	9.7 (5.8)	250	28.5* (7.6)
Four-year	493	16.8* (4.7)	493	1.8 (3.1)	475	17.0* (4.7)

*Significant at .05.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Stratum. Discrepancies also appeared in strata used to categorize institutions in NSOPF-88 and NSOPF-93, as Exhibits 2-3 and 2-4 illustrate. The stratum variable used here is the modified Carnegie stratum variable available on the NSOPF-93 faculty and institution data files. As in Exhibits 2-1 and 2-2, the LIST/IPEDS and QUEX/IPEDS discrepancies show similar patterns. However, differences between faculty counts reported on the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire and the original faculty list do not appear to be significantly different from zero. In fact, when viewed in percentage terms, LIST/QUEX discrepancies are quite small (smaller than 10 percent) in most strata.

Exhibit 2-3. Mean differences (matched pairs) in faculty counts, by stratum (modified Carnegie)

Comparison	LIST - IPEDS		QUEX - LIST		QUEX - IPEDS	
Stratum	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**
Public research	63	251.1* (97.4)	56	45.9 (146.4)	57	322.2* (109.4)
Private research	28	193.5 (425.9)	26	-71.2 (85.9)	25	-115.7 (447.2)
Public doctoral	73	148.0* (51.9)	69	27.1 (66.9)	72	144.6* (31.3)
Private doctoral	44	255.8* (102.0)	48	-66.3 (79.1)	41	172.4* (49.5)
Public comprehensive	132	73.0* (16.1)	133	16.9 (24.4)	134	82.8* (18.6)
Private comprehensive	63	27.2 (15.5)	62	35.2 (28.3)	65	75.8* (27.6)
Private liberal arts	55	22.8* (7.0)	58	-8.3 (5.5)	60	13.4* (6.4)
Public two-year	225	64.5* (18.7)	263	42.1 (23.6)	250	102.7* (24.5)
Other	35	17.6* (5.9)	45	69.6 (45.9)	42	84.0 (49.6)

*Significant at .05.

**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Exhibit 2-4. Percent differences in faculty counts (matched pairs), by stratum (modified Carnegie)

Comparison	LIST - IPEDS		QUEX - LIST		QUEX - IPEDS	
Stratum	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**
Public research	63	13.3* (5.3)	56	2.2 (6.9)	57	17.3* (5.9)
Private research	28	10.6 (24.6)	26	-3.8 (4.4)	25	-6.3 (22.5)
Public doctoral	73	19.6* (6.9)	69	3.1 (7.7)	72	19.4* (4.8)
Private doctoral	44	46.7* (19.0)	48	-8.9 (9.6)	41	32.3* (9.7)
Public comprehensive	132	16.8* (4.0)	133	3.4 (5.0)	134	19.4* (4.8)
Private comprehensive	63	8.0 (4.7)	62	10.0 (8.2)	65	24.8* (9.6)
Private liberal arts	55	18.2* (6.1)	58	-5.9 (3.7)	60	10.4* (5.2)
Public two-year	225	17.9* (5.6)	263	9.7 (5.7)	250	29.1* (7.6)
Other	35	14.8* (5.3)	45	66.0 (43.4)	42	69.5 (41.8)

*Significant at .05.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Full-time versus part-time. Exhibits 2-5 and 2-6 present paired t-tests for discrepancies between counts of part-time and full-time faculty provided by all institutions. The comparisons presented here include only those institutions which provided complete data for faculty counts of either part-time or full-time faculty members in each of the comparison sets. Patterns of discrepancies observed in these tables are similar to those observed in other exhibits. IPEDS consistently provides the lowest faculty counts. Original faculty lists appear to enumerate fewer faculty members than institution questionnaires, but the discrepancies in these QUEX/LIST comparisons are not statistically significant.

Exhibit 2-5. Paired t-tests: List, IPEDS and questionnaire data
Mean differences (full-time and part-time faculty), paired t-tests

Comparison	(LIST - IPEDS)		(QUEX - LIST)		(QUEX - IPEDS)	
Analysis/subgroup	*n*	**Mean difference (standard error)****	*n*	**Mean difference (standard error)****	*n*	**Mean difference (standard error)****
Part-time	602	48.3* (21.4)	681	8.5 (11.5)	688	43.7* (16.9)
Full-time	647	44.5* (8.6)	684	17.5 (11.4)	746	51.2* (9.0)

*Significant at .05.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Exhibit 2-6. Paired t-tests: List, IPEDS and questionnaire data
Mean percent differences (full-time and part-time faculty)

Comparison	(LIST - IPEDS)		(QUEX - LIST)		(QUEX - IPEDS)	
Analysis/subgroup	*n*	**Percent difference (standard error)****	*n*	**Percent difference (standard error)****	*n*	**Percent difference (standard error)****
Part-time	602	24.2* (12.2)	681	3.7 (5.1)	688	22.4* (10.1)
Full-time	647	11.1* (2.2)	684	4.4 (2.9)	746	14.1* (2.5)

*Significant at .05.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Date of list collection. It was speculated that the lists received early in the list collection process were of higher quality. Institutions that submitted faculty lists earlier in the list collection process may have possessed better record-keeping systems than those that submitted lists later and therefore would have shown smaller discrepancies. The t-test displayed in Exhibit 2-7 challenges this view. While it is true that a closer correspondence between the LIST and QUEX counts can be observed in the earliest months of list collection, no discrepancy (either mean difference or mean percent difference) throughout the list collection process reached statistical significance when compared to the null hypothesis of no discrepancy.

Exhibit 2-7. Month-by-month discrepancies, QUEX - LIST comparison

Comparison	*n*	Mean difference (standard error)**	Mean percent difference (standard error)**
November 1992	235	15.0 (21.6)	2.2 (3.2)
December 1992	113	-36.4 (50.1)	-5.0 (6.6)
January 1993	54	97.7 (100.7)	13.8 (14.2)
February 1993	95	-8.7 (32.4)	-1.5 (5.3)
March 1993	77	43.2 (25.5)	8.5 (5.1)
April 1993	97	63.5 (49.6)	14.7 (11.7)
May 1993	42	135.3 (84.4)	26.3 (17.5)
June 1993	42	-45.3 (122.6)	-5.5 (14.0)
July 1993	5	83.2 (160.1)	8.1 (16.9)

*Significance at .05 percent, based on paired sample t-tests.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

Medical versus non-medical institutions. The analysis found significant differences in the pattern of discrepancy between institutions IPEDS designated as "medical" and non-medical, as well as institutions IPEDS identified as hospital-related and non-hospital related. Exhibit 2-8 illustrates these patterns, concentrating on discrepancies between faculty lists and institution questionnaires. The findings considered in this exhibit reflect only discrepancies observed in institutions that responded to the NSOPF-93 institution or faculty survey. This sample of institutions does not coincide with the institutions characterized as "medical" on the NSOPF-93 institution frame. Therefore, while suggestive of general trends, the analysis is not meant to characterize the population of all medical- or hospital-related institutions in the U.S.

The analysis confounded expectations. It was anticipated that faculty counts on faculty sampling lists would be significantly lower than faculty counts reported on institution questionnaires for institutions that included a medical center or hospital. Instead, significant QUEX/LIST discrepancies were more likely to be found in non-medical institutions. A major part of this pattern of discrepancy appears to result from the under-enumeration of faculty on the faculty sampling lists (or conversely, the overcounting of faculty on the institution questionnaire). Judging by the negative signs appearing on the mean and percent discrepancies for medical- and hospital-related institutions (i.e. indicating that faculty counts provided on lists tended to be, on average, greater than faculty counts supplied on institution questionnaires), problems in estimates of health sciences faculty do not appear to stem from the exclusion of large numbers of medical faculty from the faculty sampling lists.

Exhibit 2-8. Mean difference and percent differences in faculty counts (matched pairs) Institutions with medical and hospital faculty

Medical vs. non-medical institutions				
	Mean differences (QUEX-LIST)		Mean percent differences (QUEX-LIST/LIST)	
	Total faculty		Total faculty	
Institution type	*N*	Mean (SE)	*N*	Mean (SE)
Medical	100	-22.9 (102.0)	100	-1.3 (5.7)
Non-medical	660	30.1* (11.7)	660	6.6* (2.7)
Hospital vs. non-hospital institutions				
	Mean differences (QUEX-LIST)		Mean percent differences (QUEX-LIST/LIST)	
	Total faculty		Total faculty	
Institution type	*N*	Mean (SE)	*N*	Mean (SE)
Hospital	55	-153.3 (160.5)	55	-8.3 (8.3)
Non-hospital	705	36.8* (13.1)	705	6.9* (2.5)

*Significant at .05.
**Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

The discrepancy analysis suggested that institution size was the most important predictor of a significant discrepancy between faculty counts recorded on the institution questionnaire and faculty counts recorded on the faculty sampling list. Smaller institutions showed significantly higher counts of faculty on the institution questionnaire as compared to the faculty sampling list.

2.2 Trend Analysis: 1987 and 1992

Discrepancies between faculty lists and institution questionnaires occurred in 1987 as well as in 1992. Mean discrepancies between and among the sources has not only persisted over time, but appear, in some cases, to have grown between 1987 and 1992. These discrepancies have persisted even though the criteria for defining faculty were expanded in 1992 to be more inclusive rather than exclusive. Exhibit 2-9 presents results of two-sample t-tests that measure the differences in discrepancies between 1987 and 1992.

Exhibit 2-9. Comparison of 1987 and 1992 discrepancies
Two-sample t-tests*

Statistic	Year	*n*	Mean	Standard error**	T-test *p* value*
LIST - IPEDS Mean discrepancy	1987 1992	410 718	3.0 98.9	17.3 21.2	$p>.05$
QUEX - LIST Mean discrepancy	1987 1992	410 760	8.5 23.1	16.2 16.8	$p>.05$
QUEX - IPEDS Mean discrepancy	1987 1992	410 746	11.6 105.9	14.7 20.0	$p>.05$
(L-I)/I (%) Mean percent discrepancy	1987 1992	410 718	14.1 16.9	3.8 3.9	$p>.05$
(Q-L)/L (%) Mean percent discrepancy	1987 1992	410 760	11.4 3.7	3.2 2.7	$p>.05$
(Q-I)/I (%) Mean percent discrepancy	1987 1992	410 746	15.8 19.5	3.6 4.1	$p>.05$

* Incorporates Satterthwaite correction for inequality of variances.
** Standard errors assume simple random sampling.

The widening discrepancy between faculty sampling lists and IPEDS suggests that NSOPF-93's more inclusive faculty definition served the purpose of increasing the number of faculty enumerated when compared with NSOPF-88. If mean percent discrepancies are compared between 1987 and 1992, the discrepancy between faculty counts derived from sampling lists and from institution questionnaires appears to have declined significantly. From this point of view, NSOPF-93 represented a significant improvement over NSOPF-88. Despite this, the analysis in this chapter demonstrated that discrepancies in the 1992 data were still too large to provide reliable population estimates. For this reason, a recontacting and verification effort was necessary. Chapter 3 details that effort.

Chapter III. Retrieval, Verification, and Reconciliation

This chapter discusses the effort to recontact NSOPF-93 participating institutions that 1) had QUEX/LIST discrepancies of 10 percent or more in their faculty estimates; and 2) were designated by NCES as including medical schools or hospitals. The recontact effort's objective was to determine which set of faculty estimates was correct (QUEX, LIST or, in some instances, a third set of estimates), and to determine the reasons for the original reporting discrepancies.

3.1 Identifying Institutions for Retrieval and Reconciliation

Discrepancies of 10 percent or more between faculty counts derived from the institution-provided sampling list of faculty (LIST) and the faculty counts provided in the institution questionnaire (QUEX) were identified and sorted according to the magnitude of the discrepancy. Faculty lists furnished counts for total faculty, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty. The institution questionnaire reported separate counts of each of four types of faculty in the institution: full-time instructional faculty, full-time noninstructional faculty, part-time instructional faculty, and part-time noninstructional faculty. For the discrepancy analysis, institution questionnaire (i.e., QUEX) counts for full-time and part-time faculty were derived by adding together instructional and non-instructional faculty for each type of faculty employment status (i.e., full-time, part-time). Then total faculty counts were derived by adding together QUEX counts for full-time and part-time faculty.

Of the 760 ("matched") institutions which provided both a completed institution questionnaire and a list of faculty, 450 (59 percent) showed a discrepancy of 10 percent or more between the questionnaire and the list. All 120 institutions (of the 817 participating institutions) designated by NCES as affiliated with hospitals or medical centers were included in the recontacting effort. Of these institutions, 61 were included in the set of institutions with discrepancies of 10 percent or more. Therefore, the sample of institutions selected for recontact totaled 509, which included 59 institutions employing health sciences faculty which had less than a 10 percent discrepancy. These 509 represented 62.3 percent of the 817 institutions whose faculty members participated in the NSOPF-93 faculty survey.

3.2 Review of Hard Copy Lists

Hard copy lists and other documentation were reviewed to validate new information supplied by institutions, to assist institutions in resolving discrepancies, or whenever evidence suggested a data entry or list processing error that could be corrected by a review of the hard copy documents.

Lists of faculty and accompanying documentation supplied by institutions NCES identified as having medical centers and hospitals were reviewed to check for the presence of eligible teaching, research, and clinical health sciences faculty in the relevant specialties. If the inclusion of health sciences faculty could not be determined, this issue was reviewed with the institution's staff.

3.3 Telephone Follow-up for Retrieval and Reconciliation

Five telephone interviewers were trained to recontact institutions to retrieve accurate estimates for full- and part-time faculty, and to determine the reason(s) for the discrepancy between the list and questionnaire data.

Training included both a general project overview and a briefing on the problems encountered in the original data collection effort for the list and institution questionnaire. Because the institution questionnaire respondent was the most recent contact with the institution, interviewers were instructed to begin their follow-up with him or her. If necessary, interviewers also contacted the Institutional Coordinator (the institution-assigned person who oversaw production of the faculty list, if a different person from the institution questionnaire respondent), staff in human resources or personnel, the director of institutional research, or other contacts suggested by informants or listed among documents as assisting in the preparation of the list and/or questionnaire.

A "Discrepancy Analysis Summary" (See Exhibit 3-1) was produced for each institution targeted for follow-up and reconciliation. This summary provided the following information for each institution:

- the name and UNITID of each institution;
- the total percentage of the discrepancy; and
- totals of full- and part-time faculty for both the list and the questionnaire.

The form also provided a place for interviewers to correct list and/or questionnaire estimates according to information provided by each institution and/or to code which set of figures was more accurate, or to insert a new set of estimates. A set of codes was provided for the most common reasons for discrepancies; a space was also provided for further comments or explanations. Three additional codes were added to the codes listed on the Discrepancy Analysis Summary form during the field period: Code 12 ("layoffs/downsizing" between list and questionnaire), Code 35 (non-teaching, non-faculty included in LIST or QUEX), and Code 62 (full-time equivalents [FTEs] used instead of headcount on questionnaire). Contacts (by fax and E-mail, as well as telephone) were recorded on a separate Record of Calls (see Exhibit 3-2).

Additional information useful in assessing the list and questionnaire data (e.g., the dates the list and questionnaire were completed), as well as hard copy list documentation was provided.

The field period for this reconciliation effort extended from January 3, 1996 through early March, 1996. An earlier start was precluded because most institutions were closed for the Christmas holidays.

EXHIBIT 3-1

Discrepancy Analysis Summary

QPCT = 34.294

Name of Institution: MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY
UNITID: 100000

Main Telephone:

List data:		Quex data:	
ft		ft	241
pt	1	pt	225
total	347	total	466

Discrepancy resolved by: ____

Most accurate data is found in (circle one): list quex neither

Correction to list: __________total__________ft__________pt

Correction to quex: __________total__________ft__________pt

Discrepancy is the result of:

10	different academic base years for list/quex
11	different terms (quarters/semesters)used for list/quex
20	all part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from list
21	all part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from quex
22	some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from list
23	some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from quex
24	some full-time faculty excluded from list (explain)
25	some full-time faculty excluded from quex (explain)
30	larger figure (quex) is aggregate of all campuses
31	larger figure (list) is aggregate of all campuses
32	medical school excluded from list
33	medical school excluded from quex/considered separate institution
34	unpaid faculty/honorary faculty excluded from list or quex
40	data entry error by NORC (quex)
41	data entry error by NORC (list)
50	data entry error by institution (explain)
60	differing definitions of ft faculty used for list/quex
61	differing definitions of pt faculty used for list/quex
70	Other (explain)
71	Refusal/no explanation

Comments/Explanations:

EXHIBIT 3-2

1/96 4552 NSOPF-93 Record of Calls

Name of institution ____________________
Main phone ____________________

Institution Coordinator ____________________ Phone ____________________

Questionnaire Respondent ____________________
Phone ____________________

Other Contacts:

Institutional Research ____________________
Phone ____________________

Personnel ____________________
Phone ____________________

Payroll ____________________
Phone ____________________

Other ____________________
Phone ____________________

Comments/Explanations:

____

____

Outcomes:
01 pending
02 pending (fax or email)Fax # ____________________
email address ____________________
03 Discrepancy resolved
04 Refusal/no information available/supervisor review

Record of contacts

Date/Time	Name/Title of contact	Comments (callbacks, appts.)	Outcome	Initials

3.4 Results of the Retrieval and Reconciliation Effort

Of the 817 institutions which submitted faculty lists, 509 institutions were selected for recontact. The recontact effort netted responses from 492 (96.7 percent) of the 509 institutions. Institution respondents identified the QUEX as being more accurate in 280 instances (56.9 percent), and the LIST as being more accurate for 122 (24.8 percent). Fifty-six institutions (11.4 percent) confirmed neither estimate and supplied new data, and 5 (1 percent) of the schools chose IPEDS as the most accurate estimate. An additional 29 institutions (5.9 percent) could not verify any particular estimate and therefore accepted the original LIST estimate was retained. Exhibit 3-3 displays these sources of verified data.

Exhibit 3-3. Sources for verified estimates from reconciliation effort (*n* = 492)

Source for verified estimate	Number of institutions	Percentage of responses
QUEX correct	280	56.9
LIST correct	122	24.8
Neither LIST nor QUEX correct, new data provided	56	11.4
Institution unable to choose, LIST estimate accepted	29	5.9
Other source (i.e., IPEDS) correct	5	1.0

When contacted, institution respondents were asked to provide an explanation for discrepancies between faculty list counts and institution questionnaire counts. Institutions were allowed to offer as many as three explanations for the discrepancies between their LIST and QUEX estimates. Three-hundred and seventy-four (374) institution respondents provided at least one explanation for discrepancies in faculty enumerations. Exhibit 3-4 details these responses. The second, third and fourth columns in the table give frequency breakdowns for the first, second and third reasons institutions offered for discrepancies. While the first, second and third reasons likely reflect the most important, the second most important and the least important explanation institutions gave for discrepancies, institutions were not asked explicitly to prioritize the explanations. The final column in Exhibit 3-4 reports frequencies for all explanations offered for all institutions which were able to provide an explanation for their discrepancies. This column of "valid" responses excludes refusals and "no explanation" responses.

The most common reason offered for discrepancies was the exclusion of some full- or part-time faculty, rather than the erroneous inclusion of non-instructional staff without faculty status, honorary/unpaid faculty, or other categories of ineligible staff. One hundred and eighty institutions (38.8 percent of all valid responses) gave this explanation as a reason for the discrepancies. Another factor in the discrepancies was the time interval (in some instances a year or more) between the time the list of faculty was compiled and the time the institution questionnaire was completed. For example, the list did not always include new hires for the fall term. Downsizing affected faculty counts at several institutions, and this was reflected in the discrepancies between list and questionnaire data. It is also worth noting that about 159 of reconciled institutions refused or were unable to provide a specific reason for the discrepancies.

Exhibit 3-4. Explanations institutions gave for discrepancies between LIST and QUEX (unweighted frequencies)

EXPLANATION	1st reason cited (percent) ($n = 492$)	2nd reason cited (percent) ($n = 492$)	3rd reason cited (percent) ($n = 492$)	Total reasons (all valid answers) (percent) ($n = 464$)
Different academic base years for LIST & QUEX	1.6	--	--	1.7
Different academic terms used for LIST & QUEX	10.8	--	--	11.4
Layoffs or downsizing	1.6	0.2	--	1.9
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	4.3	0.2	--	4.7
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	1.6	--	--	1.7
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	19.3	1.8	--	22.4
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	4.7	1.8	--	6.9
Some full-time faculty excluded from LIST	2.4	12.2	0.8	16.4
Some full-time faculty excluded from QUEX	0.8	2.2	--	3.2
Higher QUEX figure is an aggregate of all campuses	3.3	--	--	3.4
Higher LIST figure is an aggregate of all campuses	1.2	0.2	--	1.5
Medical school excluded from LIST	0.4	0.2	--	0.6
Medical school excluded from QUEX	0.6	0.8	--	1.5
Unpaid/Honorary faculty excluded	1.2	--	--	1.3
Ineligible faculty included in error	4.7	0.4	--	5.4
Data entry error by institution	2.0	0.4	--	2.6
Different definitions of full-time faculty used	2.2	0.8	0.6	3.9
Different definitions of part-time faculty used	1.6	1.8	0.6	4.3
FTEs used instead of headcount	.6	--	--	0.6
Other	2.6	1.2	0.2	4.3
Refusal/no explanation/no answer	32.3	75.6	97.8	--

When institutions provided a different set of faculty counts from either the original faculty list or from the institution questionnaire, their reasons varied widely. Some institutions provided a third set of numbers most often when they recognized their previous LIST or QUEX numbers contained obvious errors (e.g. including non-faculty staff). Nevertheless, most institutions that supplied a new set of estimates could not supply a specific reason for rejecting the previous set of counts in favor of the new set.

The retrieval and verification effort also confirmed that a small number of institutions excluded medical school faculty from their lists of faculty. In these cases, institutions considered their medical schools as separate from their main campuses. This resulted in sizable discrepancies at two major institutions, which included medical school faculty in one set of counts, but not in the other.

The reconciliation effort uncovered an unanticipated explanation for discrepancies. Some institutions provided "full-time equivalents" (FTEs) on the institution questionnaire rather than the actual headcount of part-time faculty. While this phenomenon was observed at only three institutions, this may highlight a general institutional bias towards underreporting part-time faculty members both on the QUEX and the LIST. Because the number of part-time instructional faculty an institution employs is a sensitive issue at some campuses, some institutions may prefer to report FTEs rather than individuals employed.

In some instances, however, where part-time faculty were overreported (on either the list or the questionnaire) the reason involved confusion between the pool of part-time or temporary staff employed by or available to the institution during the course of the academic year, and the number actually employed during the fall semester (some may not have worked at the institution for years). Another source of faculty overreporting (particularly at medical institutions) was an inability to distinguish honorary/unpaid part-time faculty from paid faculty and teaching staff.

3.5 Results of Reconciliation at Institutions Employing Health Sciences Faculty

The recontact effort included 120 institutions operating medical schools or hospitals. Exhibit 3-5 reports sources of verified data for those institutions. Exhibit 3-6 shows reasons these institutions cited for discrepancies between their institution questionnaires and their original faculty lists.

Exhibit 3-5. Sources for verified estimates from the reconciliation effort for institutions employing health sciences faculty

Source for verified estimate	Percentage of responses
QUEX correct	45.7
LIST correct	31.9
Neither LIST nor QUEX correct, new data provided	6.9
Institution unable to choose, LIST estimate accepted	12.1
Other source (i.e., IPEDS) correct	3.4

As shown in Exhibit 3-6, the most common explanation for discrepancies between counts on faculty lists and institution questionnaires for institutions with health sciences faculty was the exclusion of some part-time or full-time faculty from the list. This explanation accounted for nearly 30 percent of all explained discrepancies. Generally, institutions were more likely to exclude eligible faculty than to include ineligible faculty.

Some special problems appeared when data were collected from institutions with health sciences faculty. Medical schools are more likely to have complicated payrolls than other institutions and often do not define faculty in traditional terms. As noted earlier, some institutions also find it difficult to distinguish between unpaid "honorary" faculty and those receiving a regular paycheck. "Visiting" faculty can be defined as such for teaching no more than a single lecture (and again may not be paid).

In some cases, institutions may also find it difficult to distinguish "full-time" and "part-time" staff. For example, at one hospital-affiliated medical school, any faculty member paid with institutional (rather than hospital) funds is considered full-time, though the majority of faculty members spend most of their time in private practice and would be considered part-time at most other institutions. For this particular institution, all faculty were listed as part-time on their list of faculty, yet were reported as full-time on the institution questionnaire.

Ten large institutions considered their medical school a separate entity and therefore did not include medical faculty in their list and/or questionnaires. Three institutions excluded their medical school from their faculty sampling lists and seven excluded their medical school from their institution questionnaire. In addition, because faculty estimates must sometimes be supplied by individual schools within institutions (e.g., Surgery, Dentistry, Osteopathy, etc.), two institutions excluded one or more individual schools that did not supply data in a timely fashion, or which were located at a separate campus.

Exhibit 3-6. Explanations institutions gave for discrepancies between LIST and QUEX institutions with health sciences faculty (unweighted frequencies)

EXPLANATION	1st reason cited (percent) (*n* = 120)	2nd reason cited (percent) (*n* = 120)	3rd reason cited (percent) (*n* = 120)	Total reasons (from all valid answers) (percent) (*n* = 116)
Different academic base years for LIST & QUEX	1.7	--	--	1.7
Different academic terms used for LIST & QUEX	2.5	--	--	2.6
Layoffs or downsizing	0.8	--	--	.8
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	0.8	--	--	.8
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	0.8	--	--	.8
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	18.3	--	--	19.0
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	2.0	0.8	--	2.6
Some full-time faculty excluded from LIST	--	10.0	--	10.3
Some full-time faculty excluded from QUEX	--	2	--	1.7
Higher QUEX figure is an aggregate of all campuses	3.3	--	--	3.4
Higher LIST figure is an aggregate of all campuses	3.3	--	--	3.4
Medical school excluded from LIST	2	0.8	--	2.6
Medical school excluded from QUEX	2.5	3.3	--	6.0
Unpaid/Honorary faculty excluded	2.5	--	--	2.6
Ineligible faculty included in error	4.2	--	--	4.3
Data entry error by institution	--	--	--	--
Different definitions of full-time faculty used	3.3	--	--	3.4
Different definitions of part-time faculty used	0.8	2	0.8	3.4
FTEs used instead of headcount	--	0.8	--	.9
Other	0.8	--	--	.9
Refusal/no explanation/no answer	50.9	80.8	99.2	--

A comparison of the data presented in these exhibits with the data presented in Exhibits 3-3 and 3-4 elicits the similarities between the subset of institutions affiliated with medical schools or hospitals and the entire group of recontacted institutions. Both sets of institutions tended to verify institution questionnaire faculty counts over other possible sources of faculty counts, including their original sampling lists. However, institutions affiliated with medical schools or hospitals showed a greater tendency to verify their original sampling lists than did the recontacted institutions as a whole. Nearly 32 percent of institutions employing health sciences faculty verified the accuracy of their faculty lists compared to 24.8 percent of all recontacted institutions. This suggests that institutions affiliated with medical schools or hospitals prepared more complete and inclusive lists than other institutions.

When reasons for discrepancies are compared, it is clear that health sciences institutions did not differ greatly from the entire set of recontacted institutions. The chief reasons for discrepancies for both sets of institutions reported were the same: the exclusion of some part-time or full-time faculty from original sampling lists. However, institutions employing health sciences faculty were much less likely than all recontacted institutions to cite "different academic terms used for LIST and QUEX" as a discrepancy explanation. A total of 11.4 percent of all recontacted institutions reported this reason for their discrepancy. In comparison, only 2.6 percent of institutions affiliated with medical schools or hospitals chose this reason for their discrepancy.

3.6 Reestimating Faculty Population Based on the Reconciliation Effort

Based on revised faculty counts institutions provided during the reconciliation effort, NORC produced "best estimates" of the national faculty population. This process used as its starting database the institution-level faculty counts for full-time, part-time, and total faculty that the 817 participating institutions reported on their original faculty lists. Although data for the total number of faculty were available for all of the 817 institutions, in 84 cases, institutions that supplied a total faculty number did not supply a breakdown of the total into full-time and part-time components. To overcome this problem, a two-step procedure for deriving best estimates was used: first, deriving best estimates for total faculty and, second, deriving best estimates for full-time faculty. Best estimates for part-time faculty were simply calculated by subtracting the number of full-time faculty from the total number of faculty at each institution. Chapters 3 and 10 of the *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report* [NCES 97-467] provide technical documentation for the creation of best estimates and poststratification of final faculty weights.

The recontacting and verification effort increased the total number of faculty enumerated on the faculty list by 15,541. When these best estimates were weighted by the first-stage institution weight, they produced an increase in the estimate of total faculty population of 54,298 faculty members nationwide in the 492 reconciled institutions (representing a weighted estimate of 1,855 institutions). Exhibit 3-7 illustrates this increase. It shows the difference between weighted estimates of total faculty calculated from the original faculty list and weighted estimates of total faculty calculated from the "best estimates" based on the verified data for all reconciled institutions. Moreover, differences in weighted estimates are crossed with the explanations institutions provided for their discrepancies. The figures cited in the column marked "institutions" are the weighted frequencies of figures cited under "1st reason" in Exhibit 3-4. Therefore, the table provides an illustration of the relative importance of each explanation to the increase or decrease in the faculty population for the reconciled institutions.

By far, the most significant contribution to this increase in total faculty came from those institutions that reported that they had failed to enumerate some part-time or adjunct faculty on their original faculty lists. As the exhibit illustrates, these institutions accounted for an increase in the national faculty population estimate of 37,183 faculty members. What is more, the 3.3 percent of institutions that reported that they had excluded all part-time faculty from their original lists contributed an additional estimated 14,544 faculty members to the total.

The reconciliation effort also called attention to institutions that included ineligible faculty on their original faculty lists. Almost 6 percent of institutions reported that they included ineligible faculty on either the list or the questionnaire. As a result, these institutions lowered their "best estimate" of total faculty, producing a drop in weighted population estimates for these schools of 6,167 faculty members. Definitional problems—accounting for different populations of full-time faculty on the list and on the institution questionnaire—meant that, for 2.4 percent of the institutions, the original list included ineligible faculty. The best estimate correction lowered the national population estimate derived from these institutions by 4,475. An almost identical number of faculty (4,514) were dropped from total population estimates due to institution downsizing.

Even more striking were the institutions that explained their discrepancy by reporting that unpaid or honorary faculty were excluded from either their institution questionnaire or their faculty list. Although these institutions accounted for fewer than 1 percent of the weighted total number of reconciled institutions, they accounted for a subtraction of an estimate of 9,597 faculty members from the original faculty list. These schools tended to depend on large numbers of faculty employed by other institutions, such as hospitals or the military. Future cycles of NSOPF-93 will need to take into account special cases, such as these institutions, when describing faculty eligibility rules for institution list preparers.

As mentioned earlier, 29.7 percent (weighted) of institutions refused or were unable to supply an explanation for the discrepancy. However, these institutions accounted for a weighted estimate of only 3,206 faculty members toward the net increase of 54,298 in faculty population estimated.

Exhibit 3-7. Difference between verified data and original faculty list by first reason for discrepancy (weighted data)

Explanation	Percent of institutions	Increase or decrease in faculty population estimate (national)	
	%	*n*	%
Different academic base years for LIST & QUEX	1.7	505	0.9
Different academic terms used for LIST & QUEX	10.9	4,637	8.5
Layoffs or downsizing	2.5	-4,514	-8.3
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	3.3	14,544	26.8
All part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	1.3	-15	0.0
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from LIST	21.7	37,183	68.5
Some part-time or adjunct faculty excluded from QUEX	5.5	-538	-1.0
Some full-time faculty excluded from LIST	2.6	3,255	6.0
Some full-time faculty excluded from QUEX	1.0	396	0.7
Higher QUEX figure is an aggregate of all campuses	3.3	9,934	18.3
Higher LIST figure is an aggregate of all campuses	0.7	494	0.9
Medical school excluded from LIST	0.1	1,742	3.2
Medical school excluded from QUEX	0.2	0	0.0
Unpaid/Honorary faculty excluded	0.5	-9,597	-17.7
Ineligible faculty included in error	5.7	-6,167	-11.4
Data entry error by institution	2.3	82	0.2
Different definitions of full-time faculty used for LIST & QUEX	2.4	-4,475	-8.2
Different definitions of part-time faculty used for LIST & QUEX	1.5	308	0.6
FTEs used instead of headcount	0.3	0	0.0
Other	2.5	3,319	6.1
Refusal/no explanation/no answer	29.7	3,206	5.9
Summary	**100.0**	**54,298**	**100.0**

Exhibit 3-8 summarizes the results of the reconciliation effort for all 817 institutions whose faculty members participated in the NSOPF-93 faculty survey. The exhibit reports weighted faculty estimates for total faculty, full-time faculty and part-time faculty from three major sources: the original faculty dataset, based on the original faculty sampling list (LIST), the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire (QUEX) and the revised faculty dataset, based on reconciliation and best estimate calculation. The exhibit presents data, first, for all institutions, and second, for each of the 15 institution sampling strata. For each faculty population estimate, the table presents the raw and percent difference between the estimates. For example, in the table section describing data for "All institutions," the fourth column shows that NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire produced an estimate of the total number of faculty that exceeded the estimate produced by the original faculty data file by 135,290, a difference of 15 percent. Likewise, the revised faculty data file's estimate of the total number of faculty members exceeded the original list by 134,203, or by 14.9 percent.

On the aggregate level, the revised faculty data file's estimates closely tracked the NSOPF-93's institution questionnaire data file's estimates. As the exhibit demonstrates, most of the increase in faculty population estimated came from the 43.1 percent increase in the number of part-time faculty, an estimated increase of 131,309 faculty members. In fact, the percentage of full-time faculty estimated increased by less than 1 percent. The percentages of full-time and part-time faculty in the revised faculty dataset also match more closely the percentage of full-time and part-time faculty members estimated on the NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire. The original faculty data file estimated the full-time/part-time division in the faculty population as 66.2 percent to 33.8 percent. The NSOPF-93 institution questionnaire estimated a full-time/part-time distribution of 59.4 percent to 40.6 percent. The revised faculty data file estimated a full-time/part-time distribution of 57.9 percent to 42.1 percent. The revised estimates adhered more closely to expectations.

When these totals are disaggregated by institution sampling strata, it is clear which two strata contributed the bulk of the increase in faculty population: the public two-year stratum and the research/certainty stratum. Together, these two strata accounted for 56.2 percent of the net increase in total faculty observed when comparing the original faculty data file and the revised faculty data file. Both strata show almost no change in their estimated number of full-time faculty. In fact, the research/certainty stratum actually indicates a decline of nearly 1 percent in the number of full-time faculty estimated. Therefore, the increase in total faculty in the revised faculty data file for these two strata comes almost entirely from the increase in part-time faculty estimated in both strata. The increase in part-time faculty estimated in the research strata was more dramatic (57.9 percent) than the also large increase in the estimate of part-timers observed in the public two-year stratum (37.2 percent).

Strata 6 and 7, the strata including public and private medical institutions, displayed increases in the populations of faculty estimated. Although the institutions in these strata do not account for all health sciences faculty, they suggest that the original faculty list may have underrepresented part-time faculty—particularly in public institutions. Interestingly, faculty weights based on the original faculty list seemed to underestimate the population of full-time faculty in private institutions while overestimating the number of full-time faculty in public institutions. Changes in faculty list specifications from NSOPF-88 may explain some of these differences. In NSOPF-93, institutions were asked to include both instructional and noninstructional faculty on their sampling lists. In NSOPF-88, institutions were asked only to list instructional faculty. NSOPF-93's new requirements may have introduced more variability into estimates based on original faculty lists as institutions faced greater difficulty accounting for noninstructional faculty. These difficulties may have had disproportionate impacts on public and private institutions. Further investigation will be needed to discover the underlying reasons for this difference between public and private medical institutions.

Exhibit 3-8. Summary of reconciliation effort: National population estimates for total, full-time and part-time faculty from different sources, by sampling stratum

All institutions

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	899,765	1,035,055	1,033,966	135,290	134,201
				15.0	14.9
Full-time faculty	595,340	615,191	598,232	19,851	2,892
				3.30	0.5
Part-time faculty	304,426	419,864	435,735	115,438	131,309
				37.9	43.1

STRATUM 1: Private, other Ph.D.

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	28,914	33,072	33,494	4,158	4,580
				14.4	15.8
Full-time faculty	19,844	19,789	19,099	-55	-745
				-0.3	-3.8
Part-time faculty	9,070	13,284	14,395	4,214	5,325
				46.5	58.7

STRATUM 2: Public, comprehensive

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	138,041	150,294	151,839	12,253	13,798
				8.9	10
Full-time faculty	103,216	103,473	101,238	257	-1,978
				0.2	-1.9
Part-time faculty	34,824	46,821	50,601	11,997	15,777
				34.5	45.3

STRATUM 3: Private, comprehensive					
	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	65,320	74,718	79,228	9,398	13,908
				14.4	21.3
Full-time faculty	38,617	37,943	40,746	-674	2,129
				-1.7	5.5
Part-time faculty	26,703	36,775	38,481	10,072	11,778
				37.7	44.1

STRATUM 4: Public, liberal arts					
	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	2,677	33,801	3,240	31,124	563
				1,162.6	21
Full-time faculty	1,769	25,223	1,974	23,454	205
				1,325.8	11.6
Part-time faculty	908	8,578	1,265	7,670	357
				844.7	39.3

STRATUM 5: Private, liberal arts					
	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	63,533	61,292	63,785	-2,241	252
				-3.5	0.4
Full-time faculty	43,072	41,519	41,997	-1,553	-1,075
				-3.6	-2.5
Part-time faculty	20,460	19,773	21,788	-687	1,328
				-3.4	6.5

STRATUM 6: Public, medical

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	23,763	24,617	25,110	854	1,347
				3.6	5.7
Full-time faculty	18,921	17,025	17,327	-1,896	-1,594
				-10	-8.4
Part-time faculty	4,843	7,592	7,783	2,749	2,940
				56.8	60.7

STRATUM 7: Private, medical

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	13,064	11,901	15,540	-1,163	2,476
				-8.9	19
Full-time faculty	8,453	9,018	10,524	565	2,071
				6.7	24.5
Part-time faculty	4,611	2,883	5,015	-1,728	404
				-37.5	8.8

STRATUM 8: Private, religious

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	6,204	7,257	7,129	1,053	925
				17	14.9
Full-time faculty	3,899	4,755	4,398	856	499
				22	12.8
Part-time faculty	2,305	2,502	2,731	197	426
				8.5	18.5

STRATUM 9: Public, two-year

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	250,931	310,252	303,272	59,321	52,341
				23.6	20.9
Full-time faculty	111,826	120,780	112,538	8,954	712
				8	0.6
Part-time faculty	139,105	189,472	190,795	50,367	51,690
				36.2	37.2

STRATUM 10: Private, two-year

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	8,574	9,962	11,646	1,388	3,072
				16.2	35.8
Full-time faculty	4,972	4,517	4,667	-455	-305
				-9.2	-6.1
Part-time faculty	3,603	5,445	6,979	1,842	3,376
				51.1	93.7

STRATUM 11: Public, other

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	6,600	8,568	9,196	1,968	2,596
				29.8	39.3
Full-time faculty	5,785	6,409	6,855	624	1,070
				10.8	18.5
Part-time faculty	815	2,159	2,341	1,344	1,526
				164.9	187.2

STRATUM 12: Private, other

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	15,421	16,574	19,814	1,153	4,393
				7.5	28.5
Full-time faculty	9,337	7,052	8,992	-2,285	-345
				-24.5	-3.7
Part-time faculty	6,083	9,522	10,821	3,439	4,738
				56.5	77.9

STRATUM 13: Public, unknown

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	14,314	14,844	17,556	530	3,242
				3.7	22.6
Full-time faculty	7,278	6,496	6,981	-782	-297
				-10.7	-4.1
Part-time faculty	7,036	8,348	10,575	1,312	3,539
				18.6	50.3

STRATUM 14: Private, unknown

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	3,358	8,373	11,015	5,015	7,657
				149.3	228
Full-time faculty	2,345	5,046	6,748	2,701	4,403
				115.2	187.8
Part-time faculty	1,013	3,327	4,267	2,314	3,254
				228.4	321.2

STRATUM 15: Public, research; private, research; public, other Ph.D.

	Original faculty data file (LIST)	Institution questionnaire data file (QUEX)	Revised faculty data file (REVISED)	QUEX - LIST (Difference & percent difference)	REVISED - LIST (Difference & percent difference)
Total faculty	259,051	269,531	282,105	10,480	23,054
				4	8.9
Full-time faculty	216,005	206,148	214,147	-9,857	-1,858
				-4.6	-0.9
Part-time faculty	43,046	63,383	67,958	20,337	24,912
				47.2	57.9

Chapter IV. Sampling, Weighting, and Imputation in NSOPF-93

4.1 Independent Review of Sampling, Weighting, and Imputation

This chapter consists of an independent review of the sampling, weighting, and imputation performed for the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93) by NORC's Department of Statistics and Methodology. The review began with a careful examination of the specifications contained in the following documents: the final version of the *Sampling Plan for the 1992-93 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Full-Scale Study* (dated July 1993), the specifications for *Weighting for NSOPF-93* (dated May 1994), and the relevant sections of the *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty Data File User's Manual* (draft) that dealt with imputation. Computer code used to perform weighting adjustments was also reviewed. Based on the findings reported below, it was determined that review of programs used for imputation and for sample selection was unnecessary.

4.2 Problem Identification

As discussed earlier, two major problems manifested themselves in the NSOPF-93 faculty data file: 1) an unexpected decline in the estimates of health sciences faculty from the NSOPF-88 estimates; and, 2) a much lower estimate of part-time faculty than expected or than noted in the NSOPF-93 institution data file.

Imputation as a source of bias was dismissed because the two variables of interest, part-time/full-time status and primary area of teaching, are imputed too rarely for this to be a possibility. However, a review of the specifications for weighting identified nonresponse as a major cause of the shortfall in part-time faculty estimates. Only a limited investigation of the possible effects of nonresponse on the shortfall in health sciences faculty was possible as information on academic area (i.e., discipline/department) was unavailable for nonresponding faculty. Although discipline/department data were requested for all faculty at the time of list enumeration, as a cost saving measure this data item was entered into the sampling frame database only for humanities faculty who were oversampled.

Section 4.3 below discusses nonresponse as well as other factors that may have contributed to the shortfall in part-time faculty. Section 4.4 reviews the health sciences decline and explains why the analysis is necessarily limited. Finally, section 4.5 explains why the imputation procedures play only a minor role in either decline.

4.3 Part-Time Faculty

A major cause of the shortfall in part-time faculty is the difference in response rates between full-time faculty and part-time faculty: part-time faculty had a lower response rate. Much of this difference can be explained simply by the increased mobility of part-time faculty, and the associated difficulty in locating them. The original nonresponse weight adjustment developed for NSOPF-93 did not adequately correct for this difference in response rates because full-time/part-time status was not given a role in this adjustment. In addition, the fielding of the survey in waves had the inadvertent effect of increasing the difference in response rates.

4.3.1 Response Rates

Differential rates of response to the faculty survey among full-time faculty and part-time faculty may help to explain the shortfall in part-time faculty. The remainder of Chapter 4 considers the question of response rates from several different vantage points: faculty characteristics (race/ethnicity, full-time/part-time status, discipline, etc.), institution characteristics and features of survey implementation. The response rates reported in the exhibits in the rest of this chapter are comparable to—but not identical to—faculty response rates reported in Chapters 5 and 7 in the *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report*. Faculty characteristics considered in Chapters 5 and 7 are based on the original faculty sampling lists. To lower the amount of missing data in the exhibits reported in this chapter, some faculty characteristics missing on the original sampling lists (e.g. full-time/part-time status) were, for respondents, imputed from responses on the faculty questionnaire. In addition, some response rates reported in this chapter are based on a different sample of respondents than are the response rate tables in the *Methodology Report*. For example, the faculty response rates reported in Exhibit 4-8 differ from those reported in the *Methodology Report's* Exhibit 5-5 because they are based on 24,960 respondents with complete data on the derived faculty program area variable, X01A12, rather than on the total of 25,780 faculty questionnaire respondents on which *Methodology Report's* Exhibit 5-5 is based.

A primary factor in the part-time faculty shortfall was a lower response rate for part-time faculty members than for full-time faculty members. Exhibit 4-1 provides a comparison of the response rates for full- and part-time faculty.

Exhibit 4-1. NSOPF-93 responses rates by employment status

Status on list	Respondents		Ineligible		Total "rate" of response	Non-respondents
Full-time	88.5%	+	1.9%	=	90.4%	9.6%
Part-time	76.4%	+	8.9%	=	85.3%	14.7%
Overall*	82.2%	+	5.1%	=	87.3%	12.7%

*Includes all faculty in the sample.

The above percentages represent *all* faculty selected into the sample so that the two rightmost columns add up to 100 percent (except for rounding error). Note that unless otherwise specified, all percentages are unweighted. In fact, the different rates of ineligibility make the response rates appear closer than they are in actuality. While 88.5 percent of the full-time faculty selected responded, only 76.4 percent of the part-time faculty selected responded. This is very important, because part-time faculty did not initially receive a nonresponse weight adjustment different from that for full-time faculty. Also, ineligible participants were counted as respondents not only for the purposes of reporting a response rate (which was appropriate), but also for the purposes of the nonresponse weight adjustment. Ineligible faculty should actually be excluded during the nonresponse weight adjustment because their final "respondent" weight is zero. Therefore, the recalculated response rates (excluding ineligibles) should be 90.2 percent for full-time faculty and 83.9 percent for part-time faculty.

The original nonresponse weight adjustment divided the faculty selected into cells based on the institution stratum, institution size, and faculty stratum, as described in the sampling plan. Each cell was then given a separate nonresponse weight adjustment. Because full-time and part-time faculty were not specifically separated into different cells, part-time faculty respondents did not receive as much of a nonresponse adjustment as they should have, while full-time faculty respondents received a larger adjustment than they should have.

While faculty in different institutional strata had widely varying response rates, faculty sampling stratum does not seem to be important in terms of nonresponse differences, as illustrated in Exhibit 4-2 below.

Exhibit 4-2. NSOPF-93 response rates by faculty sampling stratum

	Respondents		**Ineligible**		**Total "rate" of response**	**Non-respondents**
Black, Hispanic	80.9%	+	4.9%	=	85.8%	14.2%
Full-time female	88.1%	+	2.4%	=	90.5%	9.5%
NEH faculty	83.8%	+	4.0%	=	87.8%	12.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	83.1%	+	4.6%	=	87.7%	12.3%
All others	80.0%	+	6.3%	=	86.3%	13.7%
Overall	82.2%	+	5.1%	=	87.3%	12.7%

It seems that race/ethnicity, gender, and full-time/part-time status within institution stratum would produce a better nonresponse weight adjustment than one based on faculty stratum. Exhibit 4-3 shows the appropriate one-way response rates for the gender and race/ethnicity variables.

Exhibit 4-3. NSOPF-93 response rates for race/ethnicity and gender

	Respondents		Ineligible		Total "rate" of response	Non-respondents
Black, non-Hispanic	81.4%	+	4.6%	=	86.0%	14.0%
Hispanic	81.7%	+	5.1%	=	86.8%	13.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	83.8%	+	4.5%	=	88.3%	11.7%
White, non-Hispanic	85.7%	+	3.8%	=	89.5%	10.5%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	78.8%	+	3.0%	=	81.8%	18.2%
Male	82.1%	+	5.0%	=	87.1%	12.9%
Female	84.0%	+	5.1%	=	89.1%	10.9%
Overall	82.2%	+	5.1%	=	87.3%	12.7%

These data indicate that the two genders have very similar nonresponse patterns, and that race/ethnicity could be collapsed into two categories: White/Asian/Pacific Islander and Black/Hispanic/American Indian/Alaskan Native. There are not enough American Indians/Alaskan Natives to form their own category.

In addition to the analyses above, there is some evidence (not shown) that within institution strata, the size of an institution affects the response rate. However, it is not clear how much of a role that part-time status plays in this since the smaller schools usually employ more part-time faculty. It is not clear without further evidence that size should be included as a part of the nonresponse weight adjustment.

4.3.2 Survey Implementation and the Part-Time Nonresponse Problem

NSOPF-93 used a two-stage sample design. First, institutions were selected and asked to provide a list of all faculty given the sampling eligibility criteria. Naturally, some institutions submitted their lists earlier than others. In order to maximize the response rate for faculty, faculty were selected and questionnaires were sent out in six data collection waves. An institution was included in the earliest wave for which the list was available. Because of the increased time allowed, and the opportunity for additional mail and telephone follow-up, faculty in earlier waves had a higher response rate than faculty in later waves. This affected the part-time faculty response rate more than the full-time faculty response rate because the percentage of faculty who are part-time faculty was higher for the later waves, as illustrated in Exhibit 4-4 below.

Exhibit 4-4. NSOPF-93 response rates by data collection wave

Wave	% Part-time faculty	Response rates		
		Full-time	part-time	Overall
1	29.6%	91.6%	88.3%	90.4%
2	32.7%	91.6%	88.3%	89.3%
3	33.6%	91.7%	86.8%	88.5%
4	36.6%	89.9%	82.6%	85.5%
5	35.1%	87.2%	79.8%	82.2%
6	35.1%	87.0%	79.2%	79.8%

These data show that while response rates decline for both full-time and part-time faculty, the overall response rate for part-time faculty was affected to a larger extent because a larger proportion of the faculty in later waves were part-timers. Note that the response rates reported here include the ineligible respondents as respondents. The effect of this multiwave effort on the difference in response rates between full-time and part-time faculty would, however, appear to be relatively minor, since the part-time response rate is clearly lower in each wave.

4.3.3 The Exclusion of Subsampled Faculty

After the sixth and last wave of faculty questionnaires were fielded, a decision was made to reduce the sample size by 2,000. This action was taken to reduce the costs of follow-up without suffering a reduction in the response rate. Some data had already been received for some faculty, though. In fact, over 60 percent of the faculty in the first three waves were already respondents when the 2,000 faculty were subsampled. Not wanting to discard any data already received, the 2,000 faculty to be excluded were selected from only those faculty members from whom no response had been received. These faculty are referred to as "initial non-respondents". This was of concern to part-timers for two reasons: 1) because part-timers have a lower response rate, they were more likely to be "initial non-respondents" than full-timers, and 2) part-timers were more concentrated in the later waves than full-timers, so a slightly higher proportion of part-time faculty were subject to exclusion. In fact, a higher proportion of part-timers were excluded. While only 4.6 percent of all full-time faculty in the sample were excluded, 6.8 percent of all the part-time faculty in the sample were affected. Exhibit 4-5 below provides a comparison of how the 2,000 exclusions affected part-time status.

Exhibit 4-5. Exclusions of faculty by employment status and wave

		Overall		Part-time		Full-time
Wave	% IR*	% excluded	% IR	% excluded	% IR	excluded
TOTAL	53.3	5.3	45.5	6.8	57.1	4.6
1	67.8	3.9	62.9	4.8	69.9	3.6
2	65.7	3.9	58.4	4.9	69.3	3.4
3	61.0	4.4	53.2	5.6	64.9	3.7
4	53.1	5.3	43.9	7.1	58.4	4.1
5	23.9	8.6	15.9	10.8	28.3	7.5
6	3.3	9.7	2.4	11.3	3.9	8.8

*Denotes the percentage of faculty who had already responded at the time of the 2,000 faculty were subsampled, i.e. the percentage of initial respondents.

When the decision to exclude the subsample of 2,000 was made, the sixth wave really had only just begun. But it is clear that, for every wave, a lower percentage of part-time faculty members had responded and therefore a higher percentage were excluded.

However, the correct weighting adjustment was performed here. Within a wave, the weights of all initial nonrespondents who were not excluded were adjusted to account for subsampling. Chapter 3 in the *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report* documents the technical details of this adjustment. Therefore, if in a particular wave of initial nonrespondents, there was a higher percentage of part-timers, then there should have been not only a higher percentage of part-timers excluded but also a higher percentage of part-timers left whose weights were inflated because of the excluded faculty. This adjustment was still not perfect because, even among the initial non-respondents, a higher proportion of part-time faculty were excluded. Exhibit 4-6 illustrates the percentage of excluded faculty by wave.

Exhibit 4-6. Percentage of initial non-respondents excluded

Wave	Overall	Part-time	Full-time
Total	11.4%	12.5%	10.7%
1	12.2%	12.8%	11.8%
2	11.3%	11.9%	10.9%
3	11.2%	12.0%	10.6%
4	11.3%	13.1%	9.9%
5	11.3%	12.8%	10.4%
6	10.0%	11.6%	9.2%

While there clearly seems to be a difference, this is a much smaller bias than is due simply to the difference in response rates. This bias was addressed within the weighting adjustment, by giving a different "exclusion" adjustment to part-time and full-time faculty within a wave.

4.4 Health Sciences Faculty

Unfortunately, the shortfall for health sciences faculty could not be investigated in the same way and with as much completeness as the shortfall of part-time faculty. As a cost saving measure, the department/discipline of these faculty was not keyed into the sampling frame database. While this information is available for respondents from the faculty questionnaire, it is not available for nonrespondents. It can be retrieved for nonrespondents only by reviewing all of the hard copy and electronic lists originally submitted by the 817 participating institutions. Not all institutions provided department/discipline information on their lists. Seven hundred seventeen (717) institutions of the 817 participating institutions (88.8 percent) provided department/discipline data on their lists. To perform a complete nonresponse analysis for faculty members in the health science disciplines, these list data would have had to have been reaccessed, coded, data-entered, verified, and then combined with the information from other databases for analysis. Because of the large cost and time involved, this process was not undertaken for NSOPF-93.

Given this limitation, it was not possible to investigate the rates of response, ineligibility, or exclusion for health sciences faculty as compared to faculty in other areas. However, the knowledge gained in the analysis of part-time faculty was used to investigate certain properties of the health sciences faculty. For example, part-time faculty had a lower response rate than full-time faculty. However, health sciences faculty were *less likely* to be part-time: 22.6 percent of the total health sciences faculty were found to be part-time, compared to 30.4 percent in other program areas.

Faculty in the later data collection waves had a lower response rate than those in earlier waves. As Exhibit 4-7 shows, health sciences faculty do not seem to be clustered in the later waves, but appear to be fairly evenly distributed across waves.

Exhibit 4-7. Percentage of health sciences faculty by wave

Wave	% of health sciences faculty
1	12.5%
2	11.2%
3	13.0%
4	11.4%
5	12.9%
6	10.7%

Finally, a check to determine whether health sciences faculty tended to work at institutions that have lower response rates was made. Exhibit 4-8 shows the institution stratum response rates for faculty in institutions that provided a list of their faculty (i.e., participating institutions). In addition to the response rates, this exhibit shows the percentage of health sciences faculty in each stratum (the second column), along with the percentage of health sciences faculty that stratum represents among all health sciences faculty (the third column). For example, 73.4 percent of the faculty in the public medical institutions are health sciences faculty. These faculty represent 14.7 percent of all health sciences faculty in the population.

While most faculty in medical schools are health sciences faculty, health sciences faculty are based in all types of institutions (with the notable exception of private religious institutions). They are not concentrated exclusively in institutions classified into the two medical sampling strata. In fact, only 20.6 percent of all health sciences faculty in the NSOPF-93 sample are found in these institutions, defined in sampling specifications as "not considered as part of a four-year college or university. Includes medical schools and medical centers." This is not surprising because the health sciences include many disciplines other than medicine, such as nutrition, nursing, veterinary medicine, and so on. Medical schools, especially private medical schools, did in fact, have lower rates of response. But because institution strata helped determine the cell structure of the nonresponse weight adjustment, these lower response rates were adjusted for. In order for their shortfall to be caused by nonresponse, health sciences faculty would have had to have lower response rates than other faculty within each of these institution types. There is no evidence to suggest whether this was the case.

Exhibit 4-8. Response rates by institution strata for health sciences

Institution stratum	Response rate	% in health sciences	% of health sciences
Private, other Ph.D.	81.5%	7.7%	2.8%
Public, comprehensive	89.3%	7.3%	11.1%
Private, comprehensive	87.9%	8.4%	6.0%
Public, liberal arts	96.7%	3.4%	0.1%
Private, liberal arts	91.0%	3.7%	2.4%
Public, medical	83.6%	73.4%	14.7%
Private, medical	77.6%	77.4%	5.9%
Private, religious	85.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Public, two-year	88.0%	11.4%	29.9%
Private, two-year	92.8%	10.7%	0.9%
Public, other	86.6%	6.0%	0.4%
Private, other	73.7%	17.5%	2.0%
Public, unknown	86.2%	8.0%	1.3%
Private, unknown	85.4%	20.6%	0.7%
Research stratum	86.3%	14.3%	21.7%
TOTAL	87.3%	12.1%	100.0%

4.5 Imputation Procedures

While the imputation programs were not examined as thoroughly as the weighting programs, it is not believed that the discrepancies in faculty estimates could be caused by the imputation process. Full-time/part-time status—as well as faculty discipline, of which the health sciences is one—were imputed only rarely. In fact, part-time/full-time status was "directly" imputed only 77 times out of the 25,780 respondents (0.30 percent). Direct imputation was performed when a data item was missing for a variable on the respondent's questionnaire, but was available on the faculty list used for sampling. In that case, data on the list were substituted for the missing data. The regression method of imputation was performed 19 times (0.07 percent).

Using weighted data, 0.37 percent of all the data was directly imputed, while an additional 0.10 percent of the data was imputed via the regression method. This amount of imputation is much too small to explain any shortfall in part-time faculty. It is interesting that all 19 of the faculty imputed via the regression method were imputed to be full-time; nevertheless, even if all 19 had been imputed to be part-time, the estimated (i.e., weighted) population of part-time faculty would have increased by only 1,090, from 304,426 to 305,516.

Similarly, the principal field of teaching, the source variable for the area of teaching variable, had only 162 out of 25,780 responses imputed (0.65 percent), via the hot-deck method. When weighted, this percentage is equal to 0.66 percent. Twenty-five of these 162 imputed faculty were assigned to the health sciences, which represents 10.65 percent of cases missing a program area when weighted. This is low when compared to the 14.7 percent (weighted) of the observed faculty members who are in the health sciences. However, even if health sciences faculty had been imputed at double the observed rate (29.3 percent), the estimate of health sciences faculty would have increased only by 1,679, from 127,498 to 129,177 (a 1.3 percent increase).

Chapter V. Adjustments for NSOPF-93 and Recommendations for Future Cycles

5.1 Adjustments for NSOPF-93

The discussion in Chapter 4 makes clear that even a large error—which did not occur—in the imputation methodology would have caused very little difference in the estimates of part-time and health sciences faculty. One general principle is worth keeping in mind, however. Because the imputation methodology uses the observed data as the model, if the observed data has a shortfall in a group of faculty, most imputations will extend this shortfall to the imputed data. Fortunately, in this study, there is simply not enough imputation on these two variables for any additional underestimation of part-time or health sciences faculty to be important. Thus, no adjustments to the imputation procedures were made.

However, based on the data gathered during the reconciliation and verification effort, nonresponse and poststratification weighting adjustments to the NSOPF-93 faculty dataset were made to remedy discrepancies in estimates. Full technical documentation is available in Chapters 3 and 10 of the *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: Methodology Report.*

5.1.1 Recalculating the Nonresponse Weighting Adjustment

Based on the evidence presented in Chapter 4, it is clear that the response rates for part-time faculty differ significantly from those of full-time faculty. The original nonresponse weighting adjustment did not foresee this possibility and, therefore, did not correct for it. To remedy this problem, the nonresponse weighting adjustment was recalculated using the following variables to create the cells for adjustment: institution sampling stratum (15 levels), part-time/full-time status (2 levels), and race/ethnicity (2 levels, i.e. white, non-Hispanic versus all others).

5.1.2 Poststratification Adjustments

The nonresponse weighting adjustment for part-time/full-time faculty did not remedy the discrepancy in total faculty estimates between the list and questionnaire. It only shifted weight from full-time faculty to part-time faculty. To address the broader problem, a poststratification adjustment to "best estimates" of faculty was implemented. The adjustment was determined separately for full-time and part-time faculty within each of the 15 institutional strata. A deeper poststratification defined by instructional/noninstructional status was considered. But after investigation, it was determined that the sample sizes of noninstructional faculty were too small to support this additional poststratification.

5.1.3 Health Sciences Faculty

For health sciences faculty, analysis of the kind performed in Chapter 4 was limited by the unavailability of department-level information for nonrespondents. This prevented an analysis of response rates, exclusion rates, and ineligibility rates for this group of faculty and other departmental areas. Moreover, a reliable estimate for the number of health sciences faculty was not identified during the retrieval and reconciliation effort. Therefore, the poststratification plan discussed above could not adjust the specific estimates of health sciences faculty. Nevertheless, the reconciliation process and general poststratification adjustments made to the NSOPF-93 faculty dataset increased the estimate of health sciences instructional faculty who taught at least one for-credit course from 80,916 to 93,860.

5.2 Recommendations for the Next NSOPF Cycle

Because it is much more difficult for institutions to compile a complete enumeration of faculty than it is to provide a simple count of them, it is unlikely that discrepancies between the list and institution questionnaire can be entirely eliminated. The faculty sampling list institutions prepared required them to provide the names, gender, race/ethnicity, employment status (part-time/full-time), and discipline (only the four NEH disciplines were data-entered) for all eligible staff. In contrast, the institution questionnaire asked only for counts of various categories of instructional and noninstructional staff, along with the breakdown for specific subgroups. One of the key *goals* for the next cycle of NSOPF should be to *minimize the potential discrepancies between list and questionnaire faculty estimates early in the study, preferably at the time of list collection.* Notwithstanding the burden of these different requests on institutions, there are a number of steps that can be taken in future NSOPF cycles to minimize the magnitude and number of discrepancies that occur.

The following recommendations to survey procedures are intended to alleviate in the next NSOPF cycle some of the problems experienced in NSOPF-93.

5.2.1 Changing Time Frames and Starting List Collection Later

To ensure that part-time staff are not missed in the list enumeration, one member of the NSOPF-93 National Technical Review Panel (NTRP) suggested beginning the list collection effort at the end of the fall term rather than at its start as occurred in NSOPF-93. Sampled institutions would be asked to compile a list of faculty for their *fall term* (encompassing October 15th to ensure comparability between NSOPF cycles). The emphasis should be on the fall term rather than on a specific date.

A later start in the list collection effort has multiple implications. A delay of three to four months would mean delaying the faculty survey accordingly. Pushing back the date of the faculty survey, while maintaining the fall term as the time frame for the questionnaire, has the potential of creating methodological problems for data quality. The NSOPF-93 faculty data collection effort spanned almost 11 *calendar* months (from the end of January to mid-December 1993 with a two month hiatus during the summer). The data collection schedule is inextricably bound up with the list collection effort, which itself spanned almost nine calendar months (October, 1992 to June, 1993). These scheduling and potential methodological problems would have to be considered in changing the start date for list collection. At a minimum, the reliability of a later faculty data collection should be assessed. Another possibility is to consider transforming the current mixed-mode data collection design (mail, with mail and telephone follow-up supplemented by telephone interviews) into a telephone survey with minimal mail follow-up. This approach presents problems such as additional cost, the unwillingness of faculty to engage in a 45-minute or longer telephone interview, and phone locating problems, particularly for part-time faculty. It is also likely to increase item nonresponse where respondents do not feel comfortable providing information over the telephone, or where they do not have records needed to answer questions readily available. All of this underscores that something as simple as a change in the list collection start date has numerous implications for other components of the survey design. This recommendation should be field-tested prior to the next cycle of NSOPF.

5.2.2 Providing Institutions with an Information Sheet

The verification and retrieval effort demonstrated that when institutions are supplied with faculty estimates, even when they are discrepant, most institutions are capable of determining which set of estimates is most accurate and can provide the reason(s) for the discrepancy. In view of this finding, it is proposed that institutional staff *at the time* of list collection be provided with an "Information Sheet," which would contain the most current IPEDS estimates along with the "best estimate" for faculty reported for NSOPF-93. The information sheet would also include a statement alerting staff that the NSOPF-93 definition of "faculty" is not identical to the IPEDS definition and that, in most instances, the institution's estimate of faculty should *exceed* that of IPEDS. (It may or may not exceed the NSOPF-93 totals depending on the actions [e.g., downsizing, increasing staff, etc.] the institution has taken between NSOPF cycles.) Institution staff could report the new list estimates on the information sheet and check these totals against the IPEDS and/or NSOPF-93 totals. Discrepancies among estimates beyond a specified threshold (e.g., 10 percent) should be explained in a "Comments" section of the one-page form. A sample "Information Sheet" could be provided to serve as a guide. Once received, the institution's list enumeration could be entered into a computerized discrepancy module. Faculty estimates from the institution questionnaire could also be entered into the discrepancy module. A discrepancy analysis would be completed for all estimates, and unexplained discrepancies beyond a specified threshold would trigger a retrieval and reconciliation call to the institution coordinator *before* faculty sample selection.

Experience during the recontacting effort suggests that when institution staff are presented with faculty estimates, they are able to indicate which one is accurate. Most institution staff contacted during the reconciliation effort were also able to offer explanations for the discrepancies. The proposed information sheet can work in a similar manner. It will provide the institution coordinator with a means to check the work of other staff who are usually responsible for preparing the list. This new procedure will encourage the coordinator to check the work of the list compiler, who must, under this procedure, supply the list estimates to the coordinator so that s/he can complete the information sheet. In doing so, it will also encourage the coordinator to review the estimates and to account for any discrepancies. This will allow the institutions, in some instances, to correct obvious errors (e.g., exclusion of non-tenure-track faculty or part-time staff) before mailing the list of faculty back to the NSOPF contractor. In other instances, where the institution is simply not equipped to provide a complete or wholly accurate list of faculty, it would alert the institution—and the NSOPF contractor—to any omissions or erroneous inclusions much earlier in the list collection effort. Even under this changed procedure, the NSOPF contractor would continue to recontact institutions to retrieve data and to reconcile discrepancies during the list collection operation.

5.2.3 Coordinating Institution Questionnaire Mailing and List Collection

Recommendation 5.2.2 requires availability of faculty estimates from the institution questionnaire at the time of list collection so that potential discrepancies can be checked and reconciled at this early stage of the operation. This recommendation offers other advantages as well. Discrepancies resulting from mailing the list and questionnaire requests during different academic terms different academic terms (e.g., Fall 1991; Fall 1992) can also be substantially reduced by mailing the institution questionnaire and the list request in the same packet, or at least timing it so that both individual requests are received at the institution at about the same time. By coordinating these requests, the NSOPF contractor can indicate explicitly in the instructions to both the list and questionnaire that the estimates requested to certain questions should be identical or very close. Whenever discrepancies are identified, institution staff would be required to resolve or explain them. By coupling the timing for both of these requests, the NSOPF contractor will be able to enter the list and questionnaire counts (along with the IPEDS counts) into a discrepancy/verification module to immediately check for discrepancies. Of course, no system is "error-proof" and institutions would be recontacted as needed to reconcile discrepancies. An immediate callback to the institution for verification and reconciliation would be triggered by specified discrepancies, especially those found between the list and the institution questionnaire.

It is possible that the extra respondent burden of cross-checking faculty lists and institution questionnaires could result in lower response rates, especially for the institution questionnaire. In NSOPF-93, 85 percent of eligible institutions provided faculty sampling lists, while 91 percent of those same institutions responded to the institution questionnaire. Although this procedure may increase the initial *appearance* of respondent burden to the institution, it also increases the likelihood that institution staff preparing the list and those completing the questionnaire (who are often not the same people) will consult each other and resolve any discrepancies before submitting the list to the NSOPF contractor. It is likely that this procedure will *reduce* respondent burden at many institutions by eliminating duplication of efforts by separate offices, and by minimizing the number of callback requests from the NSOPF contractor.

5.2.4 Changes to Questionnaire Instructions and Questions

Some of the institution questionnaire instructions and questions may have inadvertently contributed to the discrepancies in faculty estimates. To avoid confusion between the total pool of part-time and temporary faculty *available* to an institution and the total *employed* (an unintended ambiguity that caused problems for some institutions because of how part-time and temporary staff are treated), the question that asks for counts of part- and full-time instructional faculty and staff and for part- and full-time noninstructional faculty should be amended. Perhaps a separate question should be added to ask for *both* the total number of available staff and for those actually employed during the fall term. This would allow institutions to report the status of their temporary and part-time staff more accurately and without the confusion some schools experienced. Even though some institutions may be able to provide one set of these estimates only, it will at least be completely clear which set of figures the institution is providing.

Another area of ambiguity appeared in the actual faculty counts. Some institutions provided estimates of full-time equivalents (FTEs) rather than the requested headcount of individuals. Instructions to the institution questionnaire should make clear that NSOPF is seeking a *headcount of faculty*, and not a count of FTEs (or positions) unless it is expressly stated in the question.

In NSOPF-93, a number of institutions excluded medical or professional schools or satellite campuses that should have been included in their faculty enumerations. In future NSOPF cycles, explicit instructions should be provided in both the questionnaire and the list collection packet to include all such schools and campuses that do not file separately for IPEDS. If possible, a list of schools and campuses to be included could be printed in the packet given each institution, based on IPEDS information. The institution would be instructed to notify the NSOPF contractor about any changes in the status of the listed schools and satellite campuses. If an institution has any questions about which schools and campuses to include, that institution would be instructed to contact the NSOPF contractor for assistance.

Finally, a small number of institutions erroneously included all staff (including maintenance and clerical staff). This error may have been avoided had the respondent(s) carefully read the glossary on the front inside cover of the questionnaire. However, NCES and the NSOPF contractor cannot be assured that the respondent(s) will read the glossary. An additional instruction to the questions soliciting counts of faculty and staff should be added to the institution questionnaire. That instruction would briefly repeat the instruction to include only instructional and noninstructional faculty and staff. Such an instruction could include a statement referring respondents to the glossary.

5.3 Health Sciences Faculty and the Faculty Questionnaire

The total number of health sciences faculty estimated in the revised NSOPF-93 faculty dataset is 146,615. However, if the criterion ("teaching at least one course for credit") is used to select instructional faculty for analysis, the number of health sciences faculty drops to 93,860, a 36 percent decline. This decline is second only to the decline registered among Agriculture/Home Economics faculty (41.7 percent), as Exhibit 5-1 illustrates. In Exhibit 5-1, the derived variable X01A12 was used to indicate program area. This derived variable does not record a program area for 820 faculty members who were legitimately allowed to skip the question. To account for these cases, an extra category, "Program area skipped" has been added to the exhibit. Health sciences faculty show the largest single decline in the absolute number of faculty in all the program areas (a decline of 52,755 faculty members) when faculty members who do not teach at least one course for credit are screened out. Under the "teaching at least one course for credit" criterion, health sciences faculty are excluded from analysis at a rate almost twice as high as average faculty members are excluded (36.0 percent to 20.5 percent).

Exhibit 5-1: Profiles of faculty by program area in NSOPF-93 faculty questionnaire data file

	Total faculty number	Faculty teaching at least one for-credit course	Faculty members screened out	
			Number	Percent
TOTAL	1,033,966	821,700	-212,266	-20.5
Agriculture/home economics	18,964	11,057	-7,907	-41.7
Business	79,584	73,100	-6,484	-8.2
Education	78,727	61,071	-17,656	-22.4
Engineering	38,954	34,246	-4,708	-12.1
Fine arts	70,065	59,226	-10,839	-15.5
Health sciences	146,615	93,860	-52,755	-36.0
Humanities	147,800	130,199	-17,601	-11.9
Natural sciences	178,583	151,735	-26,848	-15.0
Social sciences	98,517	86,237	-12,280	-12.5
All other fields	139,121	114,493	-24,628	-17.7
Program area skipped	37,035	6,475	-30,560	-82.5

Health sciences faculty are more likely to perform individualized instruction or noncredit teaching activities than are other types of faculty participating in NSOPF-93. Of the 108,023 faculty who participate in individualized instruction and who teach no for-credit classes, 38,061 (35.2 percent) are health sciences faculty. The next highest concentration of faculty who engage in individualized instruction and who teach no for-credit courses is faculty in natural sciences, with 12,559 faculty members fitting this criterion.

Exhibit 5-2 illustrates estimates of health sciences and total faculty using different selection criteria (defined by the description and SAS code presented in the exhibit). In the exhibit, the program area derived variable X01A12 is used to identify health sciences faculty. The variable C25YES is a derived variable created to register "yes" (YES=1, NO=2) if respondents gave counts of students whom they taught individually in items C25A1 to C25A4. In effect, C25YES=1 indicates that the respondent conducted individualized instruction. Of the 593,227 faculty members who indicated that they conducted any individualized instruction, 103,808 (or 17.5 percent) were health sciences faculty. The second largest group of faculty conducting individualized instruction were found in the natural sciences (98,191 or 16.5 percent).

Analysis showed that the largest concentration of faculty who conducted individualized instruction, but who did not teach courses, was found in the health sciences. Of the estimated 76,200 faculty who conducted individualized instruction and taught no other courses (C25YES=1 & C22=0), 31,201, or 41 percent, of the total were health sciences faculty. The next largest group of faculty meeting these criteria were found in the natural sciences (8,805 or 11.6 percent). Faculty questionnaire Question C25 asks respondents to include "individual students in a clinical or research setting," a selection criterion which would appear to apply more readily to health sciences faculty than to other types of faculty. If the criterion used to select instructional faculty for analysis is modified to include faculty who conducted individualized instruction or who taught at least one for-credit course, the total number of faculty selected for analysis increases to 951,025, including 133,693 health sciences faculty. Another possible selection criterion, "any instruction for credit" (X01_1=1), which includes any instructional duties related to credit courses or advising or supervising academic activities for credit, selects for analysis 124,186 health sciences faculty of a total of 904,935 faculty meeting this criterion.

Recommendation for next NSOPF. Some criteria used to select faculty cases for analysis exclude a disproportionate number of faculty in the health sciences than faculty in other disciplines. To develop an accurate profile of health sciences faculty, questions that solicit more information on what constitutes advising or supervising academic activities for credit, noncredit courses, and advising or supervising noncredit academic activities should be added to the faculty questionnaire. Adding these questions would help to develop a more complete profile of faculty other than health sciences faculty as well.

Exhibit 5-2: Estimates of NSOPF-93 health sciences faculty populations produced with different selection criteria

Description of filter used	SAS code for filter	Total number of all faculty selected	Total number of health sciences faculty selected	Percent of total number of health sciences faculty selected
No filter used	None	1,033,966	146,615	100.0
Conducted individualized instruction OR taught at least one for-credit course	C25YES = 1 or C22a > 0	951,025	133,693	91.2
Any instruction for credit	X01_1 = 1	904,935	124,186	84.7
Conducted individualized instruction or taught at least one for-credit class AND any instruction for credit	C25YES = 1 or C22A > 0 & X01_1 = 1	886,572	119,618	81.6
Taught at least one course	C22 > 0	874,825	139,143	94.9
Taught at least one for-credit course	C22a > 0	821,700	93,860	64.0
Any individualized instruction	C25YES = 1	593,227	103,808	70.8

Attachment

Tables Comparing Faculty Totals Reported on NSOPF and IPEDS 1987-1993

Table 1--Counts of Faculty and Instructional Staff by Year and by Source and Definition of Data

	1987	1991	1992	1993
Institution Survey				
Any instruction	825,000		940,000	
Faculty status or instruction for credit			1,035,000	
Faculty Lists				
Courses for credit	770,000		713,000	
Faculty and Instructional staff whose primary responsibility is teaching or research			785,000	
Any instruction for credit			789,000	
Any instruction			842,000	
Faculty status or instruction for credit			886,000	
Faculty status or instruction			899,000	
IPEDS Staff Survey				
Faculty (Primary Respons. teaching or research)		825,000		894,000

Comments: Any instruction for credit includes individuals teaching courses for credit, those supervising thesis or dissertation committees and those involved in individualized instruction for credit. Faculty status or instruction includes anyone who has faculty status at an institution (regardless of whether they have instructional responsibilities or noninstructional responsibilities) and anyone else who has instructional responsibilities for credit (teaching assistants are not included).

Table 2--Instructional Faculty and Staff by Employment Status and by Type and Control of Institution: Fall 1992

	Total		Full-time		Part-time	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All institutions	940,000	100.0	539,000	57.3	401,000	42.6
Public research	119,000	100.0	95,000	79.8	24,000	20.2
Private research	52,000	100.0	37,000	71.2	15,000	28.8
Public doctoral	77,000	100.0	54,000	70.1	23,000	29.9
Private doctoral	49,000	100.0	31,000	63.3	18,000	36.7
Public comprehensive	139,000	100.0	94,000	67.6	45,000	32.4
Private comprehensive	70,000	100.0	34,000	48.6	36,000	51.4
Private liberal arts	57,000	100.0	38,000	66.7	19,000	33.3
Public two-year	305,000	100.0	113,000	37.0	192,000	63.0
Other	72,000	100.0	43,000	59.7	29,000	40.3

SOURCE: 1993 NSOPF "Institution Survey"

Table 3--Counts of Faculty and Instructional Staff by Employment Status and by Year, Source and Definition of Data

	Total	Full-time	Part-time
		Fall 1993	
IPEDS Staff Survey			
	893,645	533,018	360,627
		Fall 1992	
Institution Survey			
Any instruction (credit/noncredit)	940,192	539,210	400,981
Faculty status or instruction	1,035,000	615,191	419,864
Faculty Lists			
Courses for credit	712,858	494,743	238,095
Primary teaching or research	785,369	498,270	287,099
Any instruction for credit	789,437	526,222	263,215
Any instruction (credit/noncredit)	842,032	550,600	291,432
Faculty status or instruction for credit	885,796	594,369	291,427
Faculty status or instruction	899,765	595,644	304,121
		Fall 1991	
IPEDS Staff Survey			
Primary teaching or research	825,240	535,276	289,964

	Fall 1987		
Institution Survey			
Any instruction (credit/noncredit)	825,000	514,000	311,000
Faculty Lists			
Courses for credit	769,825	515,013	254,812

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1997-430-747/80190

United States
Department of Education
Washington, DC 20208–5652

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, $300

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Education
Permit No. G–17

Standard Mail (B)

719